

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
SCHIROKAUER, ARNO.—Luthers Arbeit am 'Aesop,'	73
SPITZER, LEO.—Ragamuffin, Ragman, Rigmarole and Rogue,	85
WILSON, ROBERT H.—Caxton's Chess Book,	93
CLARKSON, P. S., and C. T. WARREN.—Pleading and Practice in Shakespeare's Sonnet XLVI,	102
WRIGHT, NATHALIA.—A Source for Melville's 'Clarel': Dean Stanley's 'Sinai and Palestine,'	110
STARR, H. W.—Trumbull and Gray's 'Bard,'	116
SPARGO, JOHN W.—'Questio Quid Iuris,'	119
COROMINAS, HORTENSIA, and JOHN COROMINAS.—Spanish 'santurrón,'	122
LEVY, RAPHAEL.—The term 'language' in 'Le Pelerinage de Charlemagne,'	125
WERRY, R. R.—Samuel Rogers's Approach to the Blank-Verse Dramatic Monologue,	127
GILBERT, A. H.—Nevisanus, Ariosto, Florio, Harington, and Drummond,	129
PEERY, WILLIAM.—'Eastward Ho!' and 'A Woman Is a Weathercock,'	131
KURRELMeyer, W.—A Note on Otto Ludwig's 'Heiterkeit,'	132
FRANÇON, MARCEL.—Sur un passage de 'Pantagruel,'	133

## REVIEWS:—

PAUL HAZARD, <i>La Pensée européenne au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle de Montesquieu à Lessing.</i> [H. C. Lancaster.]	133
D. P. HARDING, <i>Milton and the Renaissance Ovid</i> [F. M. Krouse.]	135
W. J. BATE, <i>From Classic to Romantic.</i> [Robert Shafer.]	138
ANDRÉ BOURGEOIS, <i>René Boylesve: l'homme, le peintre de la Touraine.</i> [Aaron Schaffer.]	140
SIGMUND SKARD, <i>The Use of Color in Literature. A Survey of Research.</i> [H. C. Lancaster.]	142
GAVIN BONE, <i>Beowulf in Modern Verse with an Essay and Pictures.</i> [H. B. Woolf.]	143
BRIEF MENTION: <i>French Studies.</i> A Quarterly Review,	144

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER  
RAYMOND D. HAVENS  
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON  
CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
DON CAMERON ALLEN

## Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas,  
Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00  
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries  
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MP*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RR*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

## POE AS A LITERARY CRITIC

BY JOHN ESTEN COOKE

Edited with an introduction and notes

By N. BRYLLION FAGIN

This essay by the Virginia novelist John Esten Cooke, written a century ago, has just been published for the first time. It was discovered in a private collection and has now been edited with an introduction and notes by N. Bryllion Fagin of the John Hopkins University. Written immediately after Poe's death, the essay contains a vivid sketch of Poe as a lecturer and reflects contemporary opinion on Poe's life and work. This is a rare item of interest to all Poe collectors, libraries, and teachers of American literature. A facsimile of a page of the MS. is printed as a frontispiece. Price \$1.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.







# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LXII

FEBRUARY, 1947

Number 2

---

## LUTHERS ARBEIT AM 'ÄSOP'

### I

Als eine der frühesten Blüten des deutschen Literatur-Humanismus, dem wir Übersetzungen des Boccaccio, Poggio, Aretino, Äneas Silvius, Petrarca, dazu Originaldrucke des Tacitus, Seneca, Plautus, Terenz verdanken, erscheint 1477 bei Zainer in Augsburg ein *Äsop*, lateinisch und deutsch, zu einem Band zusammengestellt bzw. ins Deutsche übertragen von dem Ulmer Arzt und Humanisten Heinrich Steinhöwel.<sup>1</sup> Dem Werk war ein in der Geschichte des frühen Drucks seltener Erfolg beschieden. Der *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (I, 153-166) verzeichnet für die Jahre 1477-1501 dreizehn obd. Drucke, eine kölnische, zwei nd., eine tschechische Übertragung; wozu noch französische und englische Übersetzungen kommen, die auch auf Steinhöwels Text fussen.

Die unter dem fingierten Namen Äsops zusammengetragenen Fabeln waren ja das ganze Mittelalter hindurch gelesen, übersetzt und ausgeschrieben worden; unsere klassischen Zeugen dafür sind der *Freidank* und Boners *Edelstein*, letzterer mit dem *Ackermann aus Böhmen* zusammen das Buch, mit dem Pfister in Bamberg 1461 seinen Druck und Verlag erfolgreich eröffnet. Was hier als Reimspiel mit der epigrammatischen Moral am Schluß erscheint, ist bei Steinhöwel, dem neuen Geschmack der Zeit entsprechend, Prosa geworden, allerdings eine so gewandte und schlagfertig-direkte Prosa, daß ihr Welterfolg allein daraus schon verständlich wird. Stammler sagt ganz richtig: "Er flicht Sprichwörter und volkstümliche Redensarten ein, mischt kleine Reimlein darunter, verdeutlicht die Moral durch Anspielungen auf zeitgenössische

<sup>1</sup> Neudruck v. H. Österley als Bd. 117 der *Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart*. Tübingen, 1873.

Verhältnisse in Deutschland . . . Ausdrücklich hebt er hervor, daß seine Übersetzung den Sinn wiedergeben wolle, nicht das Wort." (*Von der Mystik zum Barock*, 30) Während also Niclas von Wyle und alle mit ihm unter Übersetzen verstehen, daß lateinische Wörter durch deutsche ersetzt werden, wodurch natürlich keine deutschen Gebilde, sondern lateinische in deutscher Sprache entstehen, macht Steinhöwel sich und die deutsche Sprache von dem lateinischen Vorbild völlig frei. Die Sprachform des *Äsop* allein schon sollte den Beifall der Zeitgenossen Steinhöwels erklären.

Er kommt ihnen aber noch in anderer Hinsicht entgegen. Man darf nämlich seine Versicherung (Bl. 264b des Erstdrucks), daß er mit Rücksicht auf weibliche Zucht und Ehre einige Stücke ausgelassen, nicht zu ernst nehmen; sein Text ist ein Konglomerat von altem Fabelgut und modernen Schlüpfrigkeiten aus den eleganten Federn Poggios und Boccaccios, vermehrt um derbe Leichtfertigkeiten nach Petrus Alfonsus. So wird, was eigentlich als Schul- und Lehrbuch der Lebensweisheit gedacht war, ein saftiges Zeugnis des *Epikurismus* des Zeitalters, seiner Leichtlebigkeit und Diesseitslust, der Luther nach seinen eigenen Worten durch die Reformation ein wuchtiges Halt gebietet.

Es war nahezu unvermeidlich, daß der Erzieher, der Volksbesserer, der Neubilder der deutschen Moral, als den Luther sich selbst mit heiligem Ernst empfand, daß der *Pädagoge* Luther auf das pädagogische Mittel der *Äsopischen Fabeln* stieß. Sein bekannter Ausspruch, ohne das Zeugnis der Kirche sei die ganze Bibel nicht mehr und nicht weniger wert als *Aesopi Fabelbuch*, enthält nämlich keineswegs das abschätzige Urteil, das man ihm untergelegt hat. Wir haben Luthers Wort aus der *Vorrede zu den Fabeln* (1530), daß er ausser der *Heiligen Schrift* nicht viele Bücher wisse, die dem *Äsop* an 'Nutz, Kunst und Weisheit' überlegen seien. Der Sinn der andern Äusserung ist natürlich, die Bibel sei selbst ohne ihre Entstehung mithilfe göttlicher Inspiration immer noch von höchstem erzieherischen Wertst, wie *Äsops Fabeln*.

Es ist bisher nicht gelungen festzustellen, wann Luther zuerst die Bekanntschaft mit *Äsop* gemacht hat und in welcher Form die alte Fabelweisheit ihm entgegentrat. Die Annahme der Herausgeber des 50. Bandes der Weimarer Luther-Ausgabe, daß Luther den *griechischen Äsop* gekannt habe (S. 433), hat keinerlei Unterlage. Im April 1530, als er auf der Koburg, seinem 'Sinai,' den Ausgang des Reichstags zu Augsburg abwartet, berichtet er an

Melanchthon von seinen drei Unternehmungen: Psalter, Propheten und *Äsop*. Zwei Briefe im Mai erwähnen wieder die Arbeit am *Äsop*, der letzte aber nur die Absicht, eine *Reinigung des Äsop* vorzunehmen, was darauf hindeutet, daß ihm der 'unreinliche' vorlag d. h. der Steinhöwels.

Johannes Mathesius gibt also von der Situation sicherlich ein recht authentisches Bild, wenn er berichtet: "*Denn als unser Doctor nun vil jar wider die Münch und Schwermer hefftig gestritten und sich mit predigen und dolmetschung inn der heyiligen Bibel abgearbeyt und sehr ein schwaches heuptlein bekam . . . will er sich auch, wie grosse leut pflegen, ein wenig erquicken und erlustern. Drumb nimmet er zu Coburg gelegenheyt nach essens, den alten Deutschen Esopum für sich und reiniget und schmücket jn mit guten und derben Deutschen worten und schönen außlegung oder sittlichen lehren und machet 16 schöner Fabel, die steck voller weißheytt, guter lehr und höflicher vermanung sein . . . wie es inn der Welt, inn Regimenten und Haußwesen auff erden pflegt zuzugehen. Wie er auch solchs sein angefangen lustig und nützlich werck mit einer ser gelerten Vorrede zieret, darinn er frey bekennet, das nach der heyiligen schrifft die feinste weltweyßheytt in vernünfftigen fabeln zu finden ist . . . Weyl nun diß die artigst und subtillest weyse eine ist, bittere und scharpffe warheytt inn die kinder zu bringen, . . . Hat unser Doctor sein mühe und arbeyt an den alten und verunreinigten Esopum legen und seinen Deutschen ein vernewertes und geschewrets mehrlein buch zurichten wollen . . . Aber weyl der teure Mann an der Biblia neben vil predigen und schreiben abgearbeyt, verblieb diß angefangene werck . . .*" (zitiert nach W. A. 50, 434 f.). So haben wir nichts weiter von Luther als die oben erwähnten 16, in Wirklichkeit 13 Nummern, die in der gleichen Reihenfolge wie die Steinhöwelschen gegeben sind. Sie waren lange Zeit nur durch Rörers Druck von 1557 bekannt, der für den Titel verantwortlich ist: *Etliche Fabeln aus Esopo / von D. M. L. verdeudscht . . .* Erst 1887 wurde in der Bibliothek des Vatikan Luthers Urschrift aufgefunden, und zwar eine erste Niederschrift mit zahlreichen Korrekturen, zum Teil wie in den Bibel-Manuskripten mit roter Tinte, und eine zweite Reinschrift der Fabeln 1 bis 7, so daß wir für sieben Fabeln wenigstens drei authentische Fassungen haben. Man darf also ruhig A. E. Berger beipflichten, der in seiner Einführung in die *Fabeln (Dt. Liter. in Entwicklungsreihen. Reihe: Reformation Bd. 1, 69 ff.)* schreibt:

“Die Originalhandschrift gibt anschaulich zu erkennen, wieviel Mühe es sich Luther auch in diesem Falle kosten ließ, das fremde Gut so einzudeutschen, daß es wie ein heimisch gewachsenes empfunden werden konnte.” Auf der nächsten Seite fährt er allerdings fort: “Vor allem aber hat er Steinhöwels Verdeutschungen meisterlich umgeformt.” Wer hat denn nun recht, Berger Seite 69 oder Berger Seite 70? Was hat Luther getan? Eingedeutscht oder umgeformt!

## II

Zweifel und Zweideutigkeit sind veranlaßt durch Rörers irreführenden Titel, als habe Luther die *Fabeln aus Äsop* verdeutscht. Dabei war Luthers Vorlage jedenfalls Steinhöwel, was nicht nur aus dem Bericht des Mathesius hervorgeht, sondern ebenso deutlich aus dem Vorwort Luthers, wenn er von seiner Absicht spricht, durch seine Ausgabe *denselbigen Deutschen schendlichen Esopum auszurotten*, und fortfährt: *Aus der Ursachen haben wir uns dis Buch fürgenommen zu fegen vnd jm ein wenig besser Gestalt zu geben, denn es bisher gehabt, Allermeist umb der Jugend willen . . .* Luther hat also keine *Fabeln aus Äsop* übersetzt, sondern Steinhöwels Übersetzung gereinigt, sauber gefegt, für die Schultube überarbeitet. Die Frage ist nicht, ob Originaltext oder Steinhöwel, sondern nur: was für ein Steinhöwel. Lag Luthern eine zweisprachige, lateinisch-deutsche Ausgabe vor oder eine nur deutsche?

Die Weimarer Ausgabe verfährt mit grosser Entschiedenheit den Standpunkt, daß Luthern der lateinische Wortlaut nicht vorlag, vermutlich weil es in den Augen der Herausgeber etwas Anrüchiges, der Grösse Luthers Abträgliches hätte, wenn er trotz eines lateinischen *Äsop* so oft dem deutschen folgt; Übereinstimmungen zwischen Steinhöwel und Luther liegen auf der Hand, folglich kennt Luther die lateinische Fassung nicht. Mit Eifer und Beflissenheit sind die Beweisstückchen zusammengetragen, aus denen sich erstens ergibt, wie oft Steinhöwel und Luther gegen den lateinischen Wortlaut zusammenstimmen, und zweitens, daß Luthers Abweichungen von Steinhöwel “sich nirgends auf den lateinischen Text zurückführen lassen.”

Aber schon das erste Zeugnis der Weimarer Ausgabe (50, 437) versagt:

In der vierten Fabel ist *canis calumniosus* von Steinhöwel nur mit *hund* wiedergegeben; dreimal ist *calumniosus* einfach nicht

übersetzt, sondern dafür eine Lücke gelassen. Luther füllt die Lücke in seiner Fabel nicht, woraus die *Weimarer Ausgabe* schliesst: "Hätte Luther den lateinischen Text als Vorlage gehabt, so wäre er vor einer Verdeutschung des Wortes nicht zurückgeschreckt." Was Steinhöwel angeht, so sind seine drei Lücken deutlich genug. Aber in Luthers knapperer Fassung besteht nur ein *einziges* Mal die Nötigung, das lateinische Wort zu übersetzen. Das Unglück will, daß der Herausgeber Thiele in seinem zweimaligen Druck der Luther-Handschrift zwei verschiedene Lesarten gibt, ohne anzugeben, ob einmal ein Irrtum seinerseits vorliegt. In *Braunes Neudrucken des 16. u. 17. Jh.* gibt er 1888 (Bd. 76, 8) Luthers Text wieder als: *Ein hund sprach fur vnrecht ein schaff an. . .* Aber in der *Weimarer Ausgabe* von 1914 liest er: *Ein hund sprach fur gericht ein schaff an*, ohne daß sich irgendwo ein Hinweis findet, welcher Druck als authentisch zu gelten hat. Vermutlich der von 1888, dem eine genaue Kollation der vatikanischen Handschrift durch einen geschulten Paläographen zugrunde liegt. Auch wäre bei fehlerhafter älterer Lesung 1914 die Gelegenheit gewesen, auf den früheren Irrtum hinzuweisen. Die Frage ist darum von Bedeutung, weil ein Hund, der ein Schaf *fur vnrecht* anspricht, *canis calumniosus*, ein verleumderischer Hund ist. Womit grade bewiesen wäre, daß Luthern der lateinische Text Steinhöwels vorgelegen hat. Der originalen Fassung *Canis calumniosus dixit deberi sibi ab ove panem* fehlt alles, was die Wendung *fur gericht* rechtfertigt. Merkwürdigerweise hat Steinhöwel dieses *vor gericht*. Und das mag ja die Quelle für Luthers Wort gewesen sein, von dem unsicher ist, wie es wirklich heißt. So lange es zwei Lesungen davon gibt, kann man die Stelle weder für noch gegen eine lateinische Vorlage Luthers verwenden.

Die weiteren Beweise sind mager: Ab und zu einmal übernimmt Luther eine 'Moral' Steinhöwels, die dem Lateinischen fehlt. In der 13. Fabel, der letzten, die Luther überhaupt überarbeitet hat, folgt er ein paar Mal wortwörtlich der deutschen Vorlage gegen die lateinische, was aber seinen Grund darin haben mag, daß er der Arbeit bereits müde geworden war. Die *fabula de duobus canibus* beginnt: *Canis parturiens rogabat alteram*; was Steinhöwel übersetzt: *Ain tragende hüntin bat mit senften schmaichenden worten demütiglich ainen hund*. Luther folgt nicht nur bei *demutigen worten*, sondern sogar bei dem verschiedenen



Geschlecht der Hunde, setzt sogar *Vom hund vnd der hunden in* den Titel.

Wem das genügt, dem gebe ich zu bedenken, daß in der dritten Fabel Steinhöwel *in medio vero flumine se deorsum mersit* wiedergibt: *Als er mitten in das waßer kam, tunket sich der frosch*. Luther fügt aber *hinuntern* hinzu, das Wort für lat. *deorsum*. In der fünften Fabel spricht Steinhöwel davon, daß der Hund *das flaisch in das waßer schynen sicht*. Luther spricht vom *schemen vom fleisch*, was nicht nur dem *umbram* der lateinischen Vorlage genau entspricht, sondern nebenbei auch noch ein schönes Zeugnis für Luthers Mundart liefert: *schemen* ist kaum noch md., eher nd. In der zwölften Fabel sind die beiden Mäuse bei Steinhöwel *husmus und feldmus*. *Mus urbanus* ist aber, wie Luther zeigt, *stadmaus*. Allerdings hat er zuerst mit Steinhöwel *hausmaus* niedergeschrieben, dann *haus-* in *stad-* korrigiert, wobei nicht notwendigerweise das Lateinische Anlaß gewesen sein muß, sondern vielleicht der Wortgebrauch: schon *Boner* hat nur *statmûs*.

Am Einfachsten nimmt man wohl an, daß Luthern eine der doppelsprachigen *Äsop*-Ausgaben Steinhöwels vorgelegen hat; so hatte er zugleich mit dem deutschen den lateinischen Wortlaut vor Augen.

### III

An der Moral der wenigen Fabeln, die Luther wirklich bearbeitet hat, gibt es kaum etwas zu reinigen. Wenn Luther dennoch der Vorlage nur ungefähr folgt, so weil das Deutsch des Schwaben von 1477 seinen Ansichten von den Aufgaben, die der Sprache hier gestellt waren, nicht entsprach. So daß sich aus einem genauen Vergleich der beiden Texte ergeben kann, was denn eigentlich Luther von der Sprache erwartet, und welche Mittel er anwendet, um die Aufgabe, eine didaktische, zu lösen.

Ihrer Kürze wegen eignet sich zur genauen Betrachtung besonders gut die berühmte Fabel vom allzu gefräßigen Hund, den das Spiegelbild des Fleisches in seinem Maul, wie es ihm aus dem Fluß entgegenscheint, verleitet, nach dem Schemen zu schnappen. *Canis* ist das erste Wort; der Träger der Handlung, *canis*, eröffnet die Geschichte. Und so übersetzt Steinhöwel: *Ain hund truog ain stük flaisch in dem mul, und lieff durch ain fließend waßer*. Luther ändert nur wenig, aber bedeutsam: *Es lieff ein hund durch ein*

*wasser strom und hatte ein stuck fleisches ym maul.* Luther zieht das Verbum aus dem Satz hervor und stellt es an die Spitze; dabei vertauscht er entgegen dem Urtext und der deutschen Vorlage die beiden Verben und wählt dasjenige der starken Bewegung und Aktivität, um mit starkem Akzent den Satz zu eröffnen. Wie aus 'ein hund truog' 'es lieff ein hund' wird, gewinnt der Satz an Frische und Beteiligtheit des Redners; denn in lebhaft-eindringlicher Rede und ungezwungener Erzählung tritt das Verbum an die Spitze des Satzes (vgl. *Sah ein Knab' ein Röslein stehn. Oder: Kommt doch da einer und fragt mich . . .*). Wie gesprochen das Ganze ist, zeigt ja auch das in einem Akzenttal stehende *ein* (*durch ein wasser strom*), das als *en* gelesen werden müsste. Rörers Druck von 1557 zerstört den frischen, hurtigen Rhythmus, indem er korrekt *einen* schreibt. Hierher gehört auch die Entwicklung von *flumen* zu *fließend waßer* zu *wasser strom*, völlig richtig verdeutscht, denn die Strömung ist es ja schließlich, die den Hund zum Narren hält.

Die Fabel lautet dann weiter bei Steinhöwel: *Im durchlouffen sicht er das flaisch in das waßer schynen, und wänet er sech ain ander stuk in dem waßer, und ward begirig das selb ouch ze niemen, und so bald er das mul uff tet, das selb ouch ze erwüschē (patefecit os, ut etiam eandem arriperet), enpfel im das, das er vor truog, und fuort es das waßer bald hinweg.*—Bei Luther: *Als er aber den schemen vom fleisch ym wasser sihet, wehnet er, Es were auch fleisch, vnd schnappet gyrig darnach, Da er aber das maul auffthet, empfiel yhm das stuck fleischs vnd das wasser furets weg.*—*Schnappet darnach*, das plastische Mundart-Wort ersetzt den allzu umständlichen und papierdeutschen Satz des Schwaben.

*Also stuont er und hett das gewiß mit dem ungewißē verlorn. Darumb welher gytiger zu vil wil, dem würt oft ze wenig.*

Der erste Satz heißt bei Luther: *Also verlор er beyde fleisch vnd schemen.* Steinhöwels Wortspiel mit der Antithese von *gewiß* und *ungewiß* hat ein rationalistisches Motiv, von dem übrigens im Lateinischen nichts zu sehen ist: zu dem, was er hat, addiere das, was er glaubt zu haben, daraus erst ergibt sich der volle Verlust. Bei Luther viel schärfer und markiert: *also verlор er beyde.* Worauf dann die Wörter *fleisch* und *schemen* Wirkliches und Scheinbares illustrieren.

Für die hausbackene und umständliche Moral: *sic sepe qui alienum querit, dum plus vult sua perdit.* findet Steinhöwel eine

ganz prächtige deutsche Wendung: *Welher gytiger ze vil wil, dem würt offt ze wenig*.—Luther bringt allerlei Sprichwörtliches, um die Lehre der Fabel zu erläutern, darunter auch: *wer zu viel haben wil, dem wird zu weng*, in enger Anlehnung an Steinhöwel. In der Reinschrift wird das dann: *Wer zu viel haben wil, der behelt zuletzt nichts*. Der abgeschwächte Gegensatz von *zu viel* und *zu wenig* wird nicht nur radikalisiert, sondern mit *nichts* als Abschluß dramatisiert. Die Lehre ist nicht mehr, daß der Habgierige wenig oder selbst nichts bekommt (dem *wird zu wenig*), sondern daß er nicht einmal, das, was er hat, behält: Bestimmtheit und Prägnanz des Ausdrucks sind nicht zu überbieten.<sup>2</sup>

In der alten Fabel vom Hahn und der Perle hat schon Steinhöwel die lateinische Wortstellung gut geändert: *Ein han suchet syne spys uff ainer mysti, und als er scharret, fand er ain kostlichs bernlin an der unwirdigen statt ligende*. Luther fasst zusammen: *Ein han scharret auff der misten und fand eine kostliche perlin*. Lateinisches *quaerere escam* ist natürlich so viel wie *Speise suchen*. Wenn es ein Hahn tut, so ist es aber eben *scharren*. Steinhöwel wagt noch nicht den Schritt von der wörtlichen zur sinngemässen Wiedergabe, d. h. er tut beides, Luther gibt dem Wort aus konkreter Anschauung vor der vagen Bezeichnung den Vorzug.

Der Hahn sagt dann bedauernd: *Si te cupidus invenisset, cum quo gaudio rapuisset* = hätte dich ain gytiger gefunden, wie mit großen fröden hett er dich uffgezuket. Luther sucht lange nach der treffenden Umschrift. *Mancher funde dich gerne* wird zu *o wie mancher funde dich herzlich gerne, der dich mit freuden aufheben wurde*. In der Reinschrift nähert er sich Steinhöwel bedeutend, ändert nur—und das verzaubert das Ganze—den Satz-akzent: *Wenn dich ein kaufmann funde, der wurde dein fro*.

Die Wiederaufnahme des Subjekts des Vordersatzes durch *der* gehört ja der Umgangssprache an, der Sprache—mit einem Lutherwort—*der Kinder, Knechte und Mägde und des armen, gemeinen, einfältigen Haufens*. Und dazu der starke Akzent auf dem abschliessenden *fro*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Richard Jente verdanke ich den Nachweis, daß Luther hier ein altbekanntes Sprichwort wiederholt. Somit wird man—hier wie überhaupt—die *Nutzanwendungen* für Luthers persönlichen Stil nicht heranziehen dürfen: sie sind Volksgut. Ähnliches gilt wahrscheinlich sogar schon für Steinhöwel.

<sup>3</sup> *Kaufmann* lesen wir auch im Erstdruck der Fabelsammlung von Erasmus Alberus von 1534, wo von einer Einwirkung Luthers nicht die Rede

*Agrum mihi pascendo devastasti:* klagt in der zweiten Fabel der Wolf das Lamm an, was bei Steinhöwel ausgezeichnet übertragen ist: *du hast mir mynen aker gar verwüst mit dynem nagen und verheret.* 'Mit dynem nagen' statt des Gerundium *pascendo* ist gut, und die Verdoppelung des Verbs ist so offensichtlich das Rechte, daß Luther gleich noch weiter geht: *du hast mir meine wisen vnd acker abgenaget vnd verderbet.* So wird nun auch *agrum* zweifach wiedergegeben. Denn nun erst hat der Satz die Feierlichkeit und Schwere der Anklage vor Gericht, der formalen Beschwerde, die auf zweigliedrige Rechtsformeln dringt: Der Wolf tut dem Lamm kund und zu wissen, es sei auf Treu und Glauben befragt, und habe Rede und Antwort zu stehn. Hier sind wir ganz in die Sphäre des peinlichen Rechtsverfahrens eingetreten; Steinhöwel hat den ersten Schritt getan, Luther tut ganze Arbeit.

Der Wolf macht bekanntlich kurzen Prozeß: *Licet tua nequeam solvere argumenta* = *wie wol ich dyne argument und ußzüg nit alle widerreden kan.* Wie es sich für die Rechtssprache gehört, sind wieder zwei Rechtswörter gesetzt für ein *argumenta*. Für Luther ist *auszüge* veraltet; seiner Gewohnheit gemäß verdeutscht er das umständliche *argumentum solvere* durch ein Wort: *ob du gleich viel schwetzens kanst, so wil ich dennoch heint zu fressen haben.*—Aber die Reinschrift erfüllt die Bedingung der Doppelung (im engen Anschluß an Steinhöwel): *Vnd wenn du gleich viel äüßreden vnd schwetzen kanst!*

Steinhöwels Wendung *rat und hülfe* in einer andern Fabel hat keine lateinische Grundlage. Ich frage mich, warum Luther wohl entgegen der deutschen Vorlage *trewen rat* schreibt, wenn er nicht vor Augen hatte: *petit auxilium*. An dieser Stelle ist aber wichtiger, daß seine Reinschrift zu Steinhöwel zurückkehrt, denn *rat vnd hülfe* ist die volkstümliche Formel.

Und noch einmal: In der vierten Fabel verläßt Luther plötzlich seine Vorlage, der er sonst fast wortwörtlich folgt. *Victa ovis tribus testibus falsis* ist bei Steinhöwel: *das schauff ward überwonden mit dry falschen zügen.* Aber bei Luther: *Also ward das schaff vber wunden, vnd verurteilt.* So beginnt noch die Reinschrift:

sein kann. Die Gleichung ist nicht etwa *cupidus* = *gytiger* = *kaufmann*, sondern die Wortwahl beruht auf *Matth.* 13. 45, wo es schon in der *Mentelbibel* von 1461 heißt: *aber das reich der himel ist gleich eim kauffman der da sücht die guten mergrisel.* Auf diesen Kaufmann, der Perlen sucht, ist angespielt.

*Also ward das schaff vber—*, streicht die alte Wendung und schreibt statt dessen ganz anders: *Also verlor das schaff seine sache.*—Überwunden war es ja durch die drei Zeugen. Nachdem sie weggefallen waren, war eigentlich für das Verbum kein Platz mehr. Ihm kommt keine Anschaulichkeit zu Hilfe.—Steinhöwel erzählt unbefangen nach dem Latein, wie die Sonne Hochzeit hält und zu Hause bleibt, worüber alle Welt ungeduldig wird *so vil, das sie ouch den öbristen got Jupiter darumb scheltwort nicht überhuobent. Darumb ward Jupiter zornig, und fraget ursach der scheltwort.* Die klassische Mythologie setzt Luthern offenbar in Verlegenheit: *Des erschrack alle welt, vnd ward so vngeduldig das sie auch ynn den hymel fluchet vnd schalt* (zwei Verben!), *Es fragt aus dem himel, was das fluchen bedeutet.* Erst den Ort, wo er wohnt, dann das Neutrum des Pronomens statt des Götternamens, weiter kann man die Vermeidung der erledigten Mythologie ja nicht treiben. Am Rande steht dann allerdings—*es fragt aus dem himel* ist ja kein Deutsch—*Jupiter fragt.* Aber der Theologe und Pädagoge kann sich damit noch nicht zufrieden geben, es heißt daher im Druck: *Es fragt Jupiter aus dem Himel, Was das fluchen bedeutet.* Erst ist er als oberster Gott verdrängt, dann ist auch noch der Platz am Anfang des Satzes zu gut für ihn. Er ist nicht mehr das ganze Subjekt, er steht im Schatten des Es. Durch die Wortstellung wird er nun ein *Jupiter aus dem Himel*, ein beiläufiger Himmelsbewohner, neben so manchem andern auch anwesend, vom 'obersten der Götter' keine Rede.

Die sechste Fabel zeigt ein Motiv Luthers, dem wir bisher noch nicht begegnet sind.

Nach etlichen Einleitungssätzen beginnt Steinhöwel: *Ain rind, ain gayß, ain schauß geselten sich* (lat. *socii fuerunt*) *zuo ainem löwen.* Wir sind nicht überrascht, bei Luther zu lesen: *Es geselleten sich, ein Rind, zigen, schaff zu einem lewen . . .* und in der Reinschrift in reinerem Rhythmus: *Es geselleten sich / ein Rind, Zigen vnd schaff / zum lewen // vnd zogen miteinander auff die jaget / ynn einen forst* (forst schon bei Steinhöwel). Sie fangen einen Hirsch und teilen ihn in vier Teile. *Ego primam tollam ut leo*, sagt der Löwe: *Den ersten tail nim ich, darumb, das ich ain leo und ain künig aller tiere bin.* Luther schreibt statt dessen: *Das erste teil geburt mir als einem lewen der aller thier konig ist.* Später rückt dieses Argument an die zweite Stelle, und der Löwe verlangt: *Ein teil ist mein aus der gesellschaft.* Für Äsop wie für



Steinhöwel besteht ein Königsrecht. Denn natürlich gründet sich die Forderung des Löwen auf den Löwenanteil zunächst auf ein verbürgtes Recht. Was Luther an dessen Stelle setzt, ist aber etwas völlig anderes. Als Teilnehmer an der Jagdpartie kommt ihm ein Viertel der Beute zu. Nichts mehr vom Königsrecht! Wir befinden uns in einer Bürgerwelt. Man darf vielleicht in dieser Änderung einen schwachen Nachhall der Bauernkriege, einen Reflex der sozialen Umwälzung sehen, deren geistigster Ausdruck unter dem Namen Reformation läuft. In der Reinschrift wird der Ausdruck ganz klar: *Ihr wisset das ein teil mein ist als ewrs gesellen, Das ander geburt mir, als ein konige vnter den thieren.* Der erste Anspruch ist unanfechtbar, der zweite aber fraglich. *Quartam vero qui tetigerit me inimicum habebit.* Wörtlich: Wer aber das vierte Stück anrührt, wird mich zum Feinde haben. Steinhöwel überträgt wieder sehr gut: *welher aber den vierden an regt, des fynd will ich syn.* Kein Wunder, daß Luther folgt: *wer aber das vierde anruret, des feind wil ich sein.* Dann notiert er am Rande—ganz frei: *wer aber das vierde haben wil, der müs mirs mit gewalt nemen.* Was vorher eine abstrakte Drohung war, die der künftigen Feindschaft, ist nun ganz ins Konkrete gewendet: *Nimm dirs doch, wenn dus haben willst.* Vom *tetigerit* ist nichts mehr geblieben. Die freche Ungeduld und nackte Willkür des Starken, der nicht erst lange nach einem Rechtsboden für sein Tun sucht, ist in einem knappen Satz deutsch geworden.

*Äsop* schließt dann: *Sic totam predam illam solus improbitate sua abstulit*, wofür Steinhöwel gradezu genial sagt: *Also schilet der untrüw leo die dry von ieren tailen und behielt er sie all.*<sup>4</sup> Aber Luther folgt ihm nicht, die Lehre, die er aus der Geschichte zieht, ist eine andere: *Also, schreibt er, hatten die drey vmbsonst gearbeitet vnd gehoff.* Oder in seiner letzten Fassung: *Also musten die drey, fur yhre muhe das nach sehen, vnd den schaden zu lohn, haben.*

Der alten Fabel ist der Löwe wichtiger als seine Opfer. Sie liegen abseits der Blickrichtung. Der Held der kleinen Erzählung ist ausschließlich der Löwe. Bei Luther zeigt sich eine Verschie-

<sup>4</sup> *schilet* vielleicht statt des erwarteten *schiltigt* von *schuldigen*; *improbare* ist in den alten Glossarien meist mit *beschuldigen* wiedergegeben. Besser aber *schielt* (<*schilet*) von *schalten*, *er stieß fort*. Wenn man die Form liest, wie sie ist, als 3. sing. präs. von *schilhen*, *schilen*, bedeutet der Satz: er vertreibt sie durch schele Blicke.

bung der Gewichte. Angedeutet hatte sie sich schon in der Argumentierung des Löwen, wie er nicht mehr allzu stark auf sein Königsrecht pocht. Aber jetzt ist der Focus plötzlich verändert, und nicht der Eine, sondern die Drei sind scharf erfasst. Es ist der Christ Luther, dem die Ohnmächtigen, ja die Ausgebeuteten, die *'umsonst gearbeitet und gehofft haben,'* näher stehen als der König unter allen Tieren. Und so gehört sein erster und sein letzter Gedanke ihnen.

Es ist kaum übertrieben zu sagen, daß hier die alte Fabel aus *Äsop* nicht ins Deutsche, sondern gradezu ins Protestantische übersetzt ist.

Ich fürchte, ich setze mich dem Verdacht der Gespensterseherei aus, wenn ich fortfahre, aus dem flüchtigen Zeitvertreib, mit dem Luther sich über bange Stunden etwas hinweghalf, Auskünfte über die Seelenstruktur des Reformators herauszulesen. Aber die Achtlosigkeit und Nebensächlichkeit dieser Niederschriften macht, daß man klarer als sonst das Genie bei der Arbeit sieht. Hier ist sie nicht Mühe, Verantwortung, Grübeln und Abwägen, sie ist einfache Lehre, vielleicht für das *'Söhnchen Hänschen,'* vielleicht für Kinder überhaupt, eine kleine Weltweisheit in anspruchslosester Form, eine *Biblia pauperum* in dem Sinn, daß nicht göttliche Eingebung, sondern der gesunde Menschenverstand das Wort führt. Was für das lächelnd hingeworfene kleine Werkchen gilt, wie viel mehr muß es erst wahr sein für den Standbild-Luther der Deutschen Bibel.

Wie die Verben als Träger einer starken Bewegung sich vervielfältigen und vordrängen; wie die Wortwahl auf Präzision dringt und den anschaulichsten Ausdruck für ein angeschauts Ding findet, wie die Sätze einfach, ihre Teile und Glieder klar unterscheidbar sind, wie sie sich gliedern nach Takt und Akzent, so daß die Stimmung des Volkslieds in ihnen anklingt, das läßt sich gut erkennen. Wenn man sie so liest, die Handvoll uralter Fabeln, prägt sich ihr saftiges Deutsch ein, als seien sie in anderer Form undenkbar. Es klingt so einfach und so notwendig; es scheint als Meisterwerk vom Himmel gefallen. Und doch ist es über und über getan und in bedächtigem Bosseln und Formen errungen.

So zeugen auch die aus dem Deutschen von 1477 übertragenen, in die Neuzeit hinüber getragenen *Fabeln* für die Grösse des Dichters Luther vierhundert Jahre nach seinem Tode.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

## RAGAMUFFIN, RAGMAN, RIGMAROLE AND ROGUE

The word *ragamuffin* is first attested in 1393 in *Piers Plowman* as the name of a demon whose "bel-syre" is Belial, and from 1581 on in the meaning 'a ragged, dirty, disreputable man or boy' (1591: *raggamouff*, 1622: *raggedemuffins*).<sup>1</sup> According to the *NED* this word is "prob. from *Rag* sb. 1 (cf. *Ragged* 1c), with fanciful ending"; in the same dictionary s. v. *ragman* we find two entries, the first of which is defined as follows:

1. 'A name given to the Devil, or one of the devils (cf. *Ragamuffin*, *Ragged*, Sw. *ragg-en* <sup>2</sup> ['devil']), first attested in two passages of *Piers Plowman*' (in the 16th c. two examples are found, coupled with the adjective *ruffy*).

2. 'A ragged person' (1440: *Prompt. Parv.*).

3. 'A rag-gatherer, -dealer' (1586).

The second, said to be of obscure origin and history, and to be more or less identical with *ragman's roll*, appears in the meanings: 1. a statute of Edward I; 2. a roll, list, catalogue; a long discourse, rhapsody, rigmarole; 3. a game of chance. The information about the second *ragman* is taken from Th. Wright, *Anecdota litteraria* (1844), who in one of the articles of this collection has published from ms. Digby n° 86 (c. 1290) a set of French quatrains, entitled *Ragemon le bon*, which he describes in the following words:

Each of the metrical quatrains of which it consists contains a personal character, good or bad, and the game appears to have been played by each lady or gentleman drawing for a character, and of course where a very bad one was drawn the drawer became an object of mirth and satire. It is evidently intended for a mixed company of both sexes, and of feudal rank, or it would not have been written in French.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the playful syllable in *tatterdemallion* (*tattertimallion*), *hobbledehoy*, *slabberdegullion*, *flibertigibbet* etc., which pattern harks back to the grotesque vocabulary of a Rabelais (*robidilardique* etc.). Cf. also Germ. *holterdipolter*.

<sup>2</sup> This Swedish word must be connected, as Prof. Einarsson tells me, with Norw. *ragg* 'grobes, struppiges haar an tieren' (Falk-Torp) and, consequently, must mean 'the hairy one.' Nothing, however, in our OF texts would indicate a connection with anything Germanic, let alone Old Norse.

Wright also quotes an English composition of the 15th century, taken from ms. Fairfax n° 16, entitled 'Here beginneth Ragmane roelle,' the first stanza of which reads:

My ladyes and my maistresses echone,  
 Lyke hit unto your humbyble wommanhede,  
 Resave in gré of my sympill persone  
 This rolle, which withouten any drede  
 Kynge Ragman me bad me sowe in brede,  
 And cristyned yt the merour of your chaunce;  
 Drawith a stryng, and that shal streight yow leyde  
 Unto the verry path of your governaunce.

Wright's description of the game in question and his explanation of the extension of its name to charters, lists, etc., by which can be explained our modern *rigmarole* (attested 1736 in this form, 1757 in the form *rigmonrowle*), is the following:

It is well known that the charter by which the Scots acknowledged their dependence on the English crown under Edward I, was popularly called a *ragman roll*; and the name was afterwards applied to other rolls. The origin of the name has been a subject of much doubt. In the chronicle of Lanercost we are told that the Scottish deed just mentioned was called *ragman* on account of the number of seals of the Scottish nobility which hung from it. It appears by the beginning of the following poem that, in the game of *Ragman*, the person seeking his character drew a string, which indicated the stanza that was to be applied to him. If we suppose (which appears to me very probable) that the stanzas were written one after another on a roll of parchment, that to each stanza a string was attached at the side, with a seal or piece of metal or wood at the end, and that, when used, the parchment was rolled up, with all the strings and their seals hanging together so that the drawer had no reason for choosing one more than another, but drew one of the strings by mere chance, on which the roll was opened to see on what stanza he had fallen; if such were the form of the game, we can very easily imagine why the name was popularly applied to a charter with an unusual number of seals attached to it, which when rolled up would present exactly the same appearance.

In the sequel the word *ragman* appears to have been used very generally for any comprehensive list of articles of all sorts arranged without any order, not "drawn up *secundum regimen*," as the compiler of the index to the Towneley Mysteries supposes. In the play of *Juditium*, in this work, Tutivillus, one of the devils who had been busily employed in catching people sinning, says (p. 311),—

Here a *rolle of ragman* of the rownde tabille,  
 Of breffes in my bag, man, of synnes dampnable.

The words "of the rownde tabille" have perhaps an allusion to some characteristic of the game. The word occurs twice in *Piers Ploughman*. The first instance is a remarkable illustration of what has been said above: it relates to the pardoner (lin. 135),

Ther preched a pardoner,  
As he a preest were;  
Broughte forth a bulle  
With many bisshopes seles,  
And seide that hymself myghte  
Assoilen hem alle.

\* \* \* \* \*

He bouched hem with his brevet,  
And blered hire eighen,  
And raughte with his *rageman*  
Rynges and broches.

Here the *ragman* is the bull with many seals. In the other passage of this poem it is applied to the devil (lin. 10,978),—

To go robbe that *rageman*,  
And reve the fruyt fro hym.

This is perhaps another word, compounded of *rage* and *mad*, and signifying a fury or wanton.

Thus Wright separates *rageman* 'devil' found in Langland from *rageman* 'name of the game and of a roll with seals' (he reads the former with a *dž* and explains it by *rage* + *mad* 'a fury or wanton'), and in this procedure, at least, he is followed by the *NED* (though this dictionary assumes *ragged* to be behind the first *rageman*), whereas Skeat and Wedgwood seem to believe the two words to be identical. The latter expressly states: "The name of *Ragman* is given to the devil in P[iers] P[lowman], and he is made to preside at our game as the father of sorcery"; however, he would explain this unified word by Swed. *ragg-en* 'devil.' We are surely safe in assuming that the one original word *Ragman* 'devil' explains both articles in the *NED*; <sup>3</sup> but since *Ragman* 'devil' (as

<sup>3</sup> The *NED* posits *rageman* n° 2 as trisyllabic because of the consistent spelling with -e- (only in the fifteenth century is the form *ragman* proved by a rhyme); but then the same should also apply to *rageman* n° 1 in its -e-spelling in Langland.



well as *King Rageman* 'father of sorcery presiding at the game of *rageman's roll*') has been historically preceded by the French *Rageman le bon* (with the typically euphemistic epithet that, in this case, serves to conceal a reference to the devil: cf. *the Eumenides*, *Pontus Euxeinos* etc.), it seems to me futile to look toward Swedish for further clarification of the etymon of Eng. *rageman* 'devil.' It is only from French that the solution can come.

Now, as far as I know, it has not been pointed out hitherto that, in Old French epics, from the thirteenth century on, there can be found a series of names used particularly of traitors and infidels (or giants), to which our *Ragemon* [*le bon*] fits both phonetically and semantically. This series, which I have extracted from Langlois, "Table des noms propres . . . dans les chansons de geste" (1904), I have grouped not in a chronological order (which, in any case, could not be rigorously established, given the difficulties of the dating of OF texts) but in one better suited to my purpose, and have added the symbols 's' (Saracen, infidel), 't' (traitor), 'g' (giant) to the particular names:

*Rogomant* s

*Rogon*: three names of t, one of which is called Seigneur de Montorgueil, with the nominative form *Rogues*. There is also a *Rogues* or *Rogonnes*, attested as a knight attending Huon de Bordeaux. A *Rogonnés l'Empereres* occurs as a crusader, along with the variant *Rogiers l'Empereres*.

*Ragon de Montayglent* t ["peut-être le même que Rogon"]

*Raguenel de Moncler*<sup>4</sup> s

*Rodoem de Monclin* s

*Rodoé*, *Rodoant de Galabre* (and three other *Rodoants*), s; *Rodoal* s; *Giroudet de Rodans*, messenger of Gui de Nanteuil; *Rodamus* s; *Rodain* s.

---

<sup>4</sup> The OF form *Raguenel* is evidently echoed by Eng. *ragnell* 'devil,' which occurs in the Chester plays (c. 1500) coupled with *ruffin* (NED s.v. *ruffin*).

There is room for doubt as to whether the radical *rag-* could belong to the word family of *ragot* 'hog' attested by Bloch-von Wartburg for the 15th c., *ragoter* 'to root like a hog' (Anjou *ragonner* 'chercher, fouiller avec un bâton, en faisant du bruit,' *raguenasser* 'manier, ou bouleverser avec du bruit'). To this word family also belongs the name of the fat pastry-cook in Rostand's *Cyrano*: *Raguenau*.

*Roboant*: seven characters: six s [one of whom is also called *Rodoant de Calabre*], 1 g; *Roboïn*<sup>s</sup>; *Raboant* ("se battit avec Enéas"<sup>6</sup>), *Rob[e]ant* ("fils de Sabaoth," i.e. of the teacher of Beuve d'Antone), *Roboastre* ("né d'une femme et d'un lutin"),

We see that the majority of the names show an -o- in the first syllable (though the -a- of *Ragemon le bon* is not isolated), and a -[m]an[t] in the last, while the first intervocalic consonant varies: -g-, -d-, -b-. If we assume the -b- to be the original consonant, this would bring us to the name of the Old Testament King Rehoboam (*Roboam* in the form of the Vulgate; his OF name is also *Roboam* e.g. in Guillaume le Clerc's *Bestiaire* v. 14<sup>7</sup> with the ms. variants *Roboan Robonans*), that son of Solomon who, after consulting with young inexperienced advisers, told his subjects that, if his father had chastised them with whips he would chastise them with scorpions, and, in the ensuing revolt, lost the ten tribes of Israel to Jeroboam—truly a haughty, treacherous king who, in the Scrip-

<sup>6</sup> This form must be identical with Lyons (and Fr. argot) *rabouin*, It. argot *rabuino* 'devil,' which, in Fr. argot, later developed the meaning 'gipsy' and, in the dialect of Anjou became a 'nom méprisant sous lequel les forains sérieux désignent les roulottiers bohêmes' (Sainéan, *L'argot ancien*, p. 348); if the -o- form is the original one, then our epic name would be the oldest attestation hitherto known of the word family, and the connection with *Roboam* would be evident; if not, we may accept the explanation of Nigra (AGE It xiv, 374), who would derive *rabouin* from *rapum* 'carrot' > 'tail' (the devil appearing with a tail), which has also given the Milanese *rabboi*, *rabozz* 'devil' (> Viennese *rawuzzel* 'bugbear,' according to Nigra—but perhaps this latter is better explained by dial. German *rabau*[z] 'coarse fellow' > Fr. *ribau*[z]).

<sup>7</sup> This name recurs in a scene of Girard de Viane where we are told the story of a *haubert jazerant* acquired from a Jew: it had belonged to the (baptized) Eneas (of whom it is said "Deus parama tant," and "se guarì a loi d'ome sachant"): "Puis le perdi el bois soz Moradant / En la bataille qu'il fist a Raboant." Since the placename *Moradanz* is reminiscent of the Saracen name *Moradas* (cf. Langlois), we are probably right in assuming that *Raboant* was a Saracen against whom the *pious Aeneas* had to fight as a true Christian.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the entire text: [the poet will tell] 'Come Salomon le temple fist, / Qui pres de quarante anz i mist, / Com apres lui vint Roboam / E come danz Jeroboam / Fu donc des dis lignees reis, / Coment donc changerent les leis, / Coment fu le temple Baal, / Coment donc commença le mal, / Qui als tens de tanz reis dura, / Coment li poeples meserra . . .'. Note in the mss. the variant of the name Jeroboam: *Gerodouans*, parallel to our *Roboam* > *Rodoant*.

tures, is judged with all the contempt due to an ignoble scion of a noble line of kings: as Moréri epitomizes his biography: "L'Ecriture sainte condamne sa mémoire, comme d'un Prince infidèle à Dieu, qui avoit toujours mal fait à sa présence, et qui ne s'étoit point mis en peine de le chercher." Is it, then, unlikely, that haughty traitors or infidels were, in the OF epics, given the name of that ill-famed Jewish King? That, in this same literature, Saracens are made to bear Old Testament names, can be easily seen from Langlois' *Table* (*Abraham, Absalon, Abel*); and giants were often considered in Old French as kinsfolk of infidels, cf. the Romance progeny of *Gog* and *Magog*. That the name of an infidel or a traitor could yield a name for the devil (or a devil) is equally likely: is the devil not The Traitor (compare also the contrary transfer of the names *Satanas* or *Adragant* [*< drago*] to heathen, as attested by Langlois, or that of *Lucifer* and *Astaroz*, cf. Sainéan, *Les sources indigènes* II, 429).<sup>8</sup>

As concerns the forms with *-d-* (*Rodoant*), there is a question whether these should have been listed with the others, since they may be connected with the Arab name *Roduan*, attested by Scheludko at Aleppo in the twelfth century. In that case, however, the derivatives of *Roduan* could have been attracted into the sphere of *Roboan*, thereby serving to explain such forms as *Rodomans*, *Rodoem*, *Rodamus*—and ultimately the Italian *Rodamonte* (of Boiardo) and *Rodomonte* (of Ariosto). The name of the boastful but brave king of Algiers who, in Boiardo's poem, is "un Capaneo, che sfidava gli Dei allo stesso modo che gli uomini" (according to Rajna's definition in "Le fonti dell' Orlando furioso," p. 53), and who becomes with Ariosto "quel fier senza pietà Breusse" (*Orl. inn.* XXIX, 30), belongs clearly to the French tradition of *Rodomans*, *Rodoant*, *Rogomant*: if it is true, as has been traditionally believed (cf. Ménage), that for *Rodamonte* (as well as for other epic names: *Sacripante*, *Gradasso*) Boiardo drew upon the stock of names current among the tenants of his estate at Scandiano, this need prove only what has been attested in other cases: that epic

<sup>8</sup> As for the comparatively few cases in which a loyal Christian knight is given a name from this series mainly devoted to infidels, we may point to the parallel example of the Arabic name of Aucassin, the Christian lover of Nicolette—to which Scheludko, *ZRPb* XLII, 484, has added other illustrations.—On Cain as the ancestor of infidels cf. M. P. Hamilton, *PMLA* LXI, 315.

names of French tradition had become quite common in Italy in the latter part of the Middle Ages (Le Duchat's 'Latin' etymology: *Rodamonte* = *rode-montes* 'ronge-montagne' is obviously nothing but a humanistic fanciful explanation, patterned on such names as Rabelais' *Rodilard*).

As for the *-g-* of *Rogomant*, *Ragomant*, Eng. *Rageman* (cf. also the Scotch form *ragment* [item 2 of the *NED*], so important for our purpose), this could perhaps be explained as a vestige of the *-h-* of the Hebrew name *Rehoboam* (*-h-* > *-g-*, cf. such French words as *magasin*, *estragon*, derived from Arabic words with *-h-*: Steiger, *Contribución*, p. 233). Another explanation has been offered by W. Kalbow in his several attempts, contradictory to each other, to derive *Rogues*, *Rogon*, *Ragon*, *Raguenel* from Germanic sources: on p. 100 of his book "Die germ. Personennamen d. afrz Heldenepos," he derives *Rogues*, *Rogon* from a Germ. *Rocco* attested by Mabillon c. 678; on p. 56 the same forms (plus *Ragon*) are traced back to a Germ. *Roggo* attested by Schönast in Alemannic sources; on p. 56 *Raguenel* is identified ("zweifellos"! ) with *Ragenus*, attested in the *Polyptichon Irminonis*. In whatever manner the question of the ultimate origin of the names in *-g-* may be decided, it seems to me that we cannot avoid the conclusion that these, just like the forms in *-d-* (*Rodoans*), were attracted into the orbit of *Roboant*. Moreover, it strikes me as very likely that the nuance of arrogance revealed in such a name as *Rogon de Montorgueil*, has come to the *Rogon-Rogue* names through the channel of the Biblical *Roboant* = *Roboam*; and I am even inclined to think that the French adjectives *rogue* 'arrogant, avec une nuance de dureté en plus,' 'dur, pénible' (Godefroy), which is first attested in the *Roman de la Rose* (where it is coupled with *fiers* and *orgueilleux* and is applied to the Pharisees) \* is nothing but our OF epic proper name *Rogues*, *Rogon* (whatever its origin), which developed first to a common noun and then to an adjective. I find a confirmation of my supposition on the group *Roboam*, *Rogomant*, *Rogues*, *rogue* in the modern argot term *rogomme* 'strong whiskey' (*rogum* in a letter of Mme de

\* Up to now no satisfactory explanation has been given of the French adjective *rogue*: ON *hrókr* is far from convincing, cf. Bloch-von Wartburg; Gamillscheg's assertion that it was first used of horses is wrong, and the modern dialectal meanings of *rogue* ('old, restive horse' etc.) are clearly secondary.

Maintenon),<sup>10</sup> which must have developed from the meaning 'rude,' cf. mod. Fr. argot *rude* 'whiskey' (Sainéan, *Le langage parisien*, p. 379), which offers a transitional form between the OF name *Rogomant* and the adjective *rogue* 'arrogant, dur.' We may assume that the type *Roboant*, *Rodoant*, *Rogomant* has, by error, or, rather, by folk-etymology, been conceived as one of those proper names derived from present participles such as *Baligant*, *Astorgant*, *Aubigant* in the *Roland* (cf. also *Rubicante*, name of a devil in Dante; *Morgante* and *Sacripante* in the Italian heroicomic poems; *Rocinante* in the *Quijote* etc.), and that, in consequence, the supposed present participle was then replaced either by the past participle: *Rodoé* (the same procedure is illustrated by OF *Derramé*, *Desramé* < Arab. *Abderrahman*,<sup>11</sup> where the ending *-ant*, ostensibly the equivalent of the ending of the present participle, was replaced by *-é*-, probably after the pattern of the couple *aumirant*—*amiré* 'commander'), or by other suffixes (*Rodoal*, *Rodamus*), or, finally, by an ending reminiscent of *oem* < *homo* (*Rodoem*). Is it not even possible that, once the participial ending had been subtracted from *Rogomant* (a stage reflected by *rogomme* 'strong whiskey'), the nominative *Rogues* was constructed (cf. the similar procedure in Celtic *mor-gwenn* > OF *Morgain*, from which a new nominative *Morgue* was formed), which appeared to fit in with the type *Begues*—*Begon*, *Otes-Oton*? If this is the case, we would not need to seek for Germanic antecedents of *Rogues*—*Rogon*, which Kalbow has tentatively assumed.

The English noun *rogue*, which, according to the *NED*, was originally a cant term of the fifteenth century, must evidently go back to the French name *Rogue* in the meaning 'devil' (which we have not hitherto found attested, but which one is warranted to assume, given, on the one hand, the name *Rogue* used of traitors and infidels and, on the other, *Ragomant*, *Rageman*, as names of the devil [cf. particularly *ragnel* 'fiend']). There is no possibility, it seems to me, of dissociating entirely, as the *NED* would have us do, the Eng. noun *rogue* from the French adjective *rogue*: they are

<sup>10</sup> I have offered a different, and perhaps, a less convincing explanation of this word in *MLN* LIX, 246.

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Artola, one of my students, has suggested to me the equation *Abder*]rahman > *Ragoman* (with *h* > *g* as in *magasin*), but the fact is that the Mohammedan ruler always appears in OF epics under the name *Derramé*. Still, the suggestion may be worth consideration.



different semantic developments from the same epic name *Rogues*, the one emphasizing more 'devilishness,' the other, 'ruthlessness.'

*Ragamouf*, *ragamuffin*, in turn, go back to a Fr. \**Rogom-ouf*[l]e or \**Ragam-ouf*[l]e, which must be a blend of *Ragemon* 'devil,' and such words as OF *ruffien*<sup>12</sup> of the fourteenth century (cf. *ruffy*, which appears associated with our word family in its first attestations) or *maroufle*; again, it could even be a coinage from the *ragemon* stem formed with the OF suffix *-ouf*[le], like *maroufle* itself (cf. the names with Germanic *-ulf* such as *Arnou*, *Marcou*, *Estouf*); Sainéan l. c. II, 429, quotes OF epic names for Sarracens of the type *Marsoufle* (> *Marsilie*), *Aarofle* (> *Aron*).<sup>13</sup> The idea of 'ragged' appears in *ragamuffin* only as late as 1440, and is consequently quite secondary: in fact, up to today, the word designates a (ragged) street urchin whom decent children should not imitate, and I suspect that 'street urchin' was the original meaning—a meaning which connects immediately with 'devil, demon, imp, heathen' (cf. on the one hand the Walloon *baligant* 'vagabond, brigand, vaurien' and mid. Fr. *baligault* 'badaud' [FEW s. v. *Baligant*], on the other, Sp. *pícaro* 'rogue,' from the name of a Picardian heretic sect, REW 6476a). Folk-etymology has again secondarily transformed the *rageman* 'devil' into a rag-man, a rag-gatherer or -dealer. It is a long way that the haughty Old Testament king has traveled, but I believe we have been able to follow step by step his declining path.

LEO SPITZER

#### CAXTON'S CHESS BOOK

Caxton's translation of *The Game and Playe of the Chcsse* exists in two original editions, the first printed at Bruges and the

<sup>12</sup> The Fr. *ruffien* -an is generally considered to be an Italianism, but the existence of an O. Prov. *rofiá rufiá* (cf. also in DuCange, s. v. *ruffiana*, a Latin text from Provence) speaks in favor of a parallel OF *ruffien*—which, moreover is postulated by Eng. *ruffin* 'fiend' (attested 1225: *ruffines of hell*; in the Chester plays *ruffian* appears as a variant of *ruffin*), of which *ruffy* may be a variant. I suppose that the \**ruffianus* family meant originally 'belonging to the devil (who is traditionally *rufus* 'red'),' and was formed in medieval Latin as the opposite of *Christ-ianus*.

<sup>13</sup> The suffix *-o[u]fle* is still in existence in mod. Fr. *argot*: *aristoffe*, *pignouf*, *patapouf* etc.

second at Westminster.<sup>1</sup> The established opinion of their relationship to each other and to their French sources, as presented by Blades,<sup>2</sup> Aurner,<sup>3</sup> Byles,<sup>4</sup> and Crotch,<sup>5</sup> can be summarized as follows:

1) Caxton's first and third chapters are derived from the literal translation of the original Latin (Jacobus de Cessolis, *Liber de Ludo Scaccorum*) by Jean Faron (or Ferron). The remainder of the *Game and Playe* comes from the freer, expanded translation by Jean de Vignay—even to the preface, in which Caxton paraphrases Vignay while changing the proper names. The combination of the two French versions is to be thought of as made by Caxton himself.

2) Caxton's translation is a literal one. The only notable alterations in his first edition are his original epilogue, and the two interpolated laments over the degeneracy of England beginning "Alas and in Engeland what hurte doon the aduocats . . ." and "Alas what haboundance was some tymes in the royames. And what prosperite . . ."

3) The second edition is essentially a reprint of the first except for its new preface and epilogue, and the addition of woodcuts.<sup>6</sup>

Disregarded by the last three authorities cited above is the fact that the Axon reprint of the Caxton first edition points out not only a few verbal alterations in the second edition (all but one of them in the table of contents), but also the presence, in the first, of still another interpolation.<sup>9</sup> This is a longish passage, identified by Axon as original because of its personal element:

<sup>1</sup> Ed<sup>1</sup> consulted in microfilm of the British Museum copy C. 10. b. 23; Ed<sup>2</sup> in the type facsimile by Vincent Figgins, *The Game of the Chesse* (London, 1855). The two editions are dated by W. J. B. Crotch, *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* (London, 1928; EETS., or. s., 176), p. xcix, as from 1475(?) and 1483, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> William Blades, *The Biography and Typography of William Caxton*. First ed. (London, 1877), pp. 171-76, 230-33; second ed. (London, 1882), pp. 173-78, 232-36.

<sup>3</sup> Nellie Slayton Aurner, *Caxton: Mirrour of Fifteenth-Century Letters* (Boston, New York, 1926), pp. 44, 79-80, 91-92, 227-30.

<sup>4</sup> Alfred T. P. Byles, *The Book of the Ordre of Chyualry* (London, 1926; EETS., or s., 168), pp. xliii, xlv.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. xcix-ci, 10-16.

<sup>6</sup> Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 37.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 64 r<sup>o</sup> (Crotch counts it as 63 r<sup>o</sup>).

<sup>8</sup> Blades, *op. cit.*, ed. 1882, p. 235, refers to the second lament (which he did not mention at all in 1877) as being added to an original text which he quotes in English, thus giving the erroneous impression that it was added only in Ed<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> *Caxton's Game and Playe of the Chesse, 1474. A verbatim reprint of the first edition. With an introduction by William E. A. Axon* (London, 1883), pp. lxxviii, 6, 39.

And also hit is to be supposyd that suche as haue theyr goodes comune & not propre is most acceptable to god / For ellys wold not thise religious men as monkes freris chanons obseruantes & all other auowe hem & kepe the wilfull pouerte that they ben professid too / For in trouth I haue my self ben conuersant in a religious hous of white freris at gaunt Whiche haue alle thyng in comyn amonge them / and not one richer than an other / in so moche that yf a man gaf to a frere .iii. d or .iiii. d to praye for hym in his masse / as sone as the masse is doon he delyuerith hit to his ouerest or procuratour in whyche hows ben many vertuous and deuoute freris And yf that lyf were not the beste & the most holiest / holy church wold neuer suffre hit in religion.<sup>10</sup>

But otherwise, the line of opinion begun by Blades has remained unchallenged.

Upon further examination of the texts, however, and of French manuscript evidence, this established view is found to require modification under each of the three headings.

1) The combination of the Faron and Vignay versions cannot be attributed to Caxton's originality, since it also exists in French manuscript tradition. A number of different composite versions are known<sup>11</sup>; and one of these, in the Cockerell MS,<sup>12</sup> agrees closely with Caxton's text. The resemblance, although including one peculiar common error,<sup>13</sup> is not complete. There are numerous

<sup>10</sup> Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 34 v<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Felix Lajard, "Jacques de Cessoles, Dominicain," *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, xxv (originally published 1869; facsimile reprint, Paris, 1898), 27-28, 32-33; also the evidence in notes 12 and 14, following.

<sup>12</sup> Now in the possession of the University of Chicago Library, Accession No. 943063, *Jacques de Cessoles, Livres des Echecs Moralises*, translated from Latin into French by Jehan de Vignay and Jehan Ferron. *Parisian MS. cir MCCLXV*. Hereafter indicated as C.

Copied on the inside of the cover is a statement by Léopold Delisle, in a letter of April 23, 1908, to Mr. Sydney C. Cockerell, then owner of the MS, "Il y . . . a six [of the MSS previously known to him, apparently] dans lesquels le texte de Jean de Vignay a été combiné avec celui de Jean Ferron. . . . Vous verrez que dans votre manuscrit . . . le copiste a combiné le texte des deux traductions."

Delisle's work on the MSS would seem to have been cut short by his death in 1910, and it has not been possible to locate any publication of his findings.

<sup>13</sup> "Ther is none that is so synfull as he that hath alle the world in despyte," Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 14 v<sup>o</sup>, is so obviously incorrect that Ed<sup>2</sup>, sign C, fol. 1 v<sup>o</sup>, emends *synfull* to *blisful* (variation noted by Axon, *op. cit.*, p. 39, calling the Ed<sup>1</sup> reading a misprint). Yet MS C, fol. 7 r<sup>o</sup>, has "Il nest nul si grant pechie comme celui qui ha tout le monde en despit," and it can be seen that *pechie* is mistakenly copied from a nearby sentence.

small variants in which Caxton's originality cannot be suspected; chapter headings are missing from the MS, which in its table of contents indicates the first three chapters only; and it commences, not with the Vignay preface which Caxton paraphrases, but with the Faron preface modified by the insertion of Vignay's name as author.<sup>14</sup> Yet on the basis of the fundamental correspondence, one must believe that Caxton derived his combination of Faron and Vignay from a MS related to the Cockerell, rather than that he coincidentally made the same combination.

The Faron element in this combined version should be recognized as extending, in the chapter headings, to the very end of the work. For although, in wording, Caxton's headings correspond fairly well to those of a Vignay text, the Plimpton MS,<sup>15</sup> the

<sup>14</sup> C, fol. 1 r<sup>o</sup>, "A noble home *et* discret bertran aubery escuier de tarascon frere jehan de vignay de lordre dez freres de haut pas son petit *et* humble chappelain . . ." Cf. the Faron preface—Paulin Paris, *Les Manuscrits François de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, v (Paris, 1842), 62, quoting MS B. N. fr. 578—"A Noble et discret homme Bertrand Aubant, escuier de Tarascon, frere Jehan Ferron, de l'ordre des frères prescheurs de Paris, son petit et humble chappelain . . ." and the Vignay and Caxton prefaces in Crotch, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-13.

The same insertion of Vignay's name in the Faron preface, suggesting other combined versions similar to that in C and Caxton, is found in MS B. N. fr. 2146 (described by Lajard, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28, under the former number 7978 anc. fonda, as a combination which it is hard to identify with that in C) and MS 1321 in Guillaume de Bure, *Catalogue des Livres de la Bibliothèque de feu M. le Duc de la Vallière*, Vol. I (Paris, 1783)—MS now in Stockholm according to a note by Cockerell inside the cover of C; described by De Bure as the Faron version, but perhaps erroneously, from superficial collation. Similar insertions are also implied in the remark of Paulin Paris, *op. cit.*, v, 15, "Plusieurs fois la grande célébrité de Jean de Vignay a fait qu'on a mis sous son nom la traduction de son émule Jean Farron."

<sup>15</sup> *Le Jeu des Echecs Moralisé*, MS 282 in the collection owned by Mrs. George A. Plimpton, on deposit with the Plimpton Library, Columbia University. Consulted in microfilm. Hereafter indicated as P.

As might be expected where there is a complicated manuscript background, and where some of the phraseology might be re-created independently out of knowledge of the contents of the chapters, Ed<sup>1</sup> shows a variety of cross-agreements with the opening of the table of contents preserved in C (fol. 1 v<sup>o</sup>), with both table of contents and chapter headings in P, and even in one instance with the original Latin text of De Cessolis as quoted by Lajard, *op. cit.*, p. 15: the appearance of "epilogacion" in the final headings of Ed<sup>1</sup> but not of P.

division of the twenty-four chapters into four tractates, which is to be found in Caxton and at the beginning of the Cockerell MS,<sup>16</sup> is a feature of the original Latin text which is preserved in Faron's translation but not in Vignay's.<sup>17</sup>

As to the text proper, one must regard Blades's limitation of the Faron influence with scepticism. Such scepticism can be based on the known complexities of the French texts (with wide variations among different MSS of each translation, yet the two translations agreeing so closely in Tractate IV that the possibility of plagiarism has had to be considered),<sup>18</sup> and on Blades's failure to indicate the manuscript basis of his statement. It is confirmed by partial collation of the Plimpton MS, which after the end of Tractate I (which according to Blades includes all the Faron material) still shows Caxton failing to reproduce what seem characteristic Vignay expansions.<sup>19</sup> It could be established, however, only by an elaborate textual study.

2) Collation of Caxton's text with the Cockerell and Plimpton MSS<sup>20</sup> not only confirms Axon's inference that the entire passage on communism quoted above is original to Caxton, without source in the French,<sup>21</sup> but also indicates some smaller departures from a close literal translation.

Two short passages, each expanding upon a suggestion in the French but without precise manuscript source, reproduce the elegiac tone which is to be found in the well known interpolations referred to above (and also, it must be conceded, in a number of laments which Caxton needed only to translate):

<sup>16</sup> Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 3 r<sup>o</sup> and *passim*; C, fol. 1 v<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Lajard, *op. cit.*, pp. 13, 30. (*Cf. P, passim.*)

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 31-33.

<sup>19</sup> In P, Chapter IV (not to be found in Caxton, Tractate II, Chapter I): a series of quotations from Isidore and David, and the first part of one from Seneca; later, quotations of three Biblical texts, and one gloss. At the beginning of P, Chapter v (not in Caxton, II, ii): a long argument about the French traditions against female succession, including an historical excursion back to the fall of Troy.

<sup>20</sup> C collated completely, P on points of special interest, and for the three passages where there are missing leaves in C, lying between fols. 7-8, 15-16, 28-29 in the modern numbering, which makes no account of the omissions.

<sup>21</sup> *Cf. C*, fol. 16 v<sup>o</sup>; P, fol. 41.

La simple parole dun prince doit estre plus estable que le serement dun marchant.

The simple parole or worde of a prynce ought to be more stable thenne the oth of a marchaunt / Alas how kepe the prynces their promises in thise dayes / not only her promises but their othes her sealis and wrytynges & signes of their propre handes / alle faylleth god amende hit.<sup>22</sup>

Scipion dauffricque dit quil nest rien sy fort a maintenir comme est amour iusque a la mort et que vraies amours sont fortes a trouuer / et especialment qui sont souuerains sur les autres / et qui ont a gouuerner commun de peuple // Et vraiment on trouueroit peu qui portast lonneur de son amy deuant le Juge.

Scipion of Affricque sayth that there is no thyng so stronge / as for to mayntene loue vnto the deth The loue of concupiscence and of lecherye is sone dissoluyd and broken / But the verray true loue of the comyn wele and prouffit now a dayes is selde founden / wher shall thou fynde a man in thyse dayes that wyll expose hymself for the worshippe and honour of his frende / or for the comyn wele . selde or neuer shall he be founden.<sup>23</sup>

Clearly original to Caxton's version are the dimensions in English measures assigned to the walls of Babylon in addition to the translated Lombard and French ones.<sup>24</sup> In four superficially parallel passages, however, in which Caxton goes to the trouble of pointing out that he is giving in *English* the etymologies of the name Philometor<sup>25</sup> and the word *mulier*,<sup>26</sup> and the meaning of two pieces of Latin verse,<sup>27</sup> he is in fact merely retranslating a French translation. Thus only the references to the English language (in the first of which the word "english" takes the place of "francois" in the source) constitute variations from strict literalness in following the French. Their motive, difficult to conceive in rational terms, presumably must lie in some feeling for naturalness of

<sup>22</sup> C, fol. 3 v<sup>o</sup>; P, fols. 8 v<sup>o</sup>-9 r<sup>o</sup>, similar; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 8 r<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> C, fol. 8 v<sup>o</sup>; quotation after *mort* completed from P, fol. 26 r<sup>o</sup>; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 19 r<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> C, fols. 32 v<sup>o</sup>-33 r<sup>o</sup>; P, fol. 66 r<sup>o</sup>, similar; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 62 v<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> C, fol. 2 r<sup>o</sup>; P, fol. 3 v<sup>o</sup>, lacks the statement that the meaning given is "en francois"; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 4 v<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> C, fol. 25 v<sup>o</sup>; P, fol. 54 v<sup>o</sup>; neither text contains the reference to Latin *mollis aer* which appears in Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 49 v<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> C, leaf missing; P, fol. 38 v<sup>o</sup>; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 31 v<sup>o</sup>; note that Caxton in freely translating *morte ruant subita* by *shal ben deffetid by sodeyn deth* follows the French rendering *mort soudaine tout ce deffait* without its motive of providing a rhyme for *bienfait* (*merita, merites*). C, fol. 19 r<sup>o</sup>; P, fol. 45 r<sup>o</sup>; both MSS lack the original Latin preserved in Ed<sup>1</sup> fol. 39 r<sup>o</sup>.



expression when one's reader is to be conscious of the translation process.

Still harder to explain is the following correspondence:

De ce dit len.i. dit *commun en france*. Tant uault amour *comme argent dure*. quant argent fault amour est nulle.

Herof men saye a comyn prouerbe in england / that loue lasteth as longe as the money endureth / and whan the money faylleth than there is no loue.<sup>28</sup>

What look to be two genuine English proverbs, on the other hand, are also introduced in place of a literal translation, one of them with some violence to the meaning of the original:

Tout ce que len luy dit soit tenu secret laquelle chose est contre la nature de plusieurs femmes quar aucunes celent mauuaisement ce que elles sceuent. . . . that she be secrete and telle not suche thynges as ought to be holden secrete / Wherefore it is a comyn prouerbe that women can kepe no counceyle.<sup>29</sup>

Il nous auient souuent aux grans digners que quant nous sommes saoul dez nobles viandes les viandes vilez nous sont agreables.

Hit happeth ofte tymes in grete festes & dyners / that we be fylde wyth the sight of the noble and lichorous metis and whan we wolde ete we ben saciat and fild / And therefore hit is sayd in prouerbe / hit is better to fylle the bely than the eye.<sup>30</sup>

In either case, manuscript variation in Caxton's immediate source is a conceivable alternative explanation, as it is for three short passages near the end of the book which amount to cursory summaries of longer portions of the French text,<sup>31</sup> or for a variety of small alterations, additions, and omissions which one hesitates to assign in their entirety to Caxton's originality, or even to his misunderstanding and carelessness.

<sup>28</sup> C, fols. 18 v<sup>o</sup>-19 r<sup>o</sup>; P, fol. 44 v<sup>o</sup>, similar but without *en france*; one suspects that in both MSS the words have been rearranged, destroying a *uault-fault* rhyme; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 38 v<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> C, fol. 4 v<sup>o</sup>; quotation after *secret* completed from P, fol. 13 r<sup>o</sup>; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fols. 9 v<sup>o</sup>-10 r<sup>o</sup> (after *prouerbe* another *that women* seems to have been printed, but is heavily marked through).

<sup>30</sup> C, fol. 27 v<sup>o</sup>; P, fol. 57 r<sup>o</sup>, similar; Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 52 v<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>31</sup> C, fol. 35; P, fols. 70 v<sup>o</sup>-71 r<sup>o</sup>; about a page of text reproduced by the sentence "And therefore . . . extremyte," Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 66 v<sup>o</sup>. C, fol. 36 r<sup>o</sup>, about half a page; P, fols. 71 v<sup>o</sup>-72 r<sup>o</sup>, longer; reproduced by the short passage "Certainly . . . shamfast," Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 67. C, fol. 37 r<sup>o</sup>, about a quarter of a page; P, fol. 73 r<sup>o</sup>, longer; reproduced by the sentence "A Iuge . . . owen place," Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 68.

3) Variants in the table of contents of the second edition, similar to the five cited by Axon from the Third Tractate, are to be found from beginning to end of the table, and are so extensive that it should be considered a new piece of work. Yet it is not independent of the first edition.

Such a relationship is possible because, in the first edition, the headings which stand at the beginnings of the successive chapters are not identical, as might be expected, with those in the table of contents. They show differences in vocabulary and word order, and in general are a little fuller. In the second edition, these actual chapter headings are reprinted with only a few omissions of words;<sup>32</sup> some changes of indention, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and abbreviation; and the consistent addition of *capitula primo*, and so forth, at the ends. The reprinting is, indeed, so faithful as to repeat the erroneous *second chappitre* for what actually is the third chapter of the Fourth Tractate, and is correctly labelled *capitula tercio*.<sup>33</sup>

Now in the table of contents of the second edition, there exist not only this same added Latin numbering, and the characteristic printer's style in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and abbreviation, but also those significant variations in wording from the first edition table which have been referred to already. Sometimes these are to be described as original, or at least random. For the most part, however, they bear an unmistakable resemblance to the wording of the chapter headings in the first edition.

A few examples will demonstrate this:

First Edition Table of Contents	First Edition Chapter Headings	Second Edition Table of Contents
This booke conteyneth .iiii. traytees / The first traytee is of the Inuencion of this playe of the chesse / and conteyneth .iii. chapitres The first chapitre is	This first chapter of	This book is deuyded and departed in to four traytyes and partyes.  The first traytye  How the playe of the

<sup>32</sup> In the heading of Tractate iv, Chapter ii: *hym*; iv, iv: *Is*; iv, v: *Is*; iv, vii: *treteth*.

<sup>33</sup> Quotations from Ed<sup>2</sup>; Ed<sup>1</sup>, *seconde chapitre*, no Latin number.

First Edition Table of Contents	First Edition Chapter Headings	Second Edition Table of Contents
vnder what kynge this playe was founden	the first tractate shew- eth vnder what kynge the play of the chesse was founden and maad	chesse was fyrst foun- den and vnder what kyng capitulo . . . j
The .ii. chapitre / who fonde this playe	This second chapitre of the first tractate sheweth who fonde first the playe of the chesse	Who fond first the playe of the chesse capitulo . ij
The .iii. chapitre / tre- teth of .iii. causes why hit was made and founden	The thirde chapitre of the first tractate treteth wherfore the playe was founden and maad	Wherfore the play was founden and maad Capi- tulo iiij
The seconde traytee treteth of the chesse men and conteyneth .v. chapitres		The second traytye
The first chapitre tre- teth of the forme of a kynge and of such thinges as apperteyn to a kynge	The seconde tractate / the first chapter tret- eth of the forme of a kynge of his maners and of his estate	The forme of a kyng of his maners and estate ca j
And the eyght and laste chapitre is of the epile- gacion. And of the recapitulacion of all these forsaide chapitres.	The eyght chapitre and the last of the fourth book of the epi- logacion and recapitula- cion of this book.	Of the epilogacion and recapitulacion of thys book viij. <sup>24</sup>

It is also true that similarity in printer's style produces an appearance of even closer relationship between the new table of contents and the chapter headings which appear with it in the second edition, but *a priori* scepticism of Caxton's having copied his table from headings appearing later in the same volume is confirmed by textual evidence. For the *hym of he meuyth hym* in the heading of Chapter II of the Fourth Tractate, first edition, which is reproduced in the second edition table of contents, is one of the words omitted in its chapter headings.<sup>25</sup> Accordingly, it is to be

<sup>24</sup> Ed<sup>1</sup>, fol. 3 (*to* supplied from Axon, *op. cit.*, p. [5], for a lacuna in the microfilmed copy) and *passim*; Ed<sup>2</sup>, sign. A, fols. 2 v<sup>o</sup>-3 r<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> See n. 32, above. Ed<sup>2</sup>, table of contents, *he meuyth hym*; Ed<sup>1</sup> table of contents entirely different.

concluded that the chapter headings of the first edition provided the copy from which the table of contents of the second was set up.

Caxton's reasons for this procedure may only be conjectured. Conceivably he wished to bring the wording of table of contents and chapter headings into closer agreement. In this case he might also have had the first edition table before him, and we should thereby have an explanation of the few slight resemblances between it and the second edition table, against the first edition chapter headings,<sup>36</sup> which must otherwise be assigned to coincidence in the operation of verbal habits. Yet the use of the first edition for only such a few small points does not seem psychologically probable. Neither does turning to the chapter headings for the purpose of obtaining verbal agreement, and yet leaving so many disagreements as still exist, and are to be seen in part in the parallel texts cited above. Both improbabilities can be somewhat more readily credited if we think of the text of the new table of contents as being produced largely by a compositor under Caxton's direction, rather than by Caxton himself.

More likely, however, would seem to be a mechanical explanation. Loss of the opening and closing leaves of early texts was common, and if the copy of Caxton's first edition which he was using for reprinting had been so mutilated, the separate chapter headings would have provided the only possible source for the new table of contents.

ROBERT H. WILSON

*University of Texas*

---

#### PLEADING AND PRACTICE IN SHAKESPEARE'S SONNET XLVI

Mine eye and heart are at a mortal war  
How to divide the conquest of thy sight;  
Mine eye my heart thy picture's sight would bar,  
My heart mine eye the freedom of that right.  
My heart doth plead that thou in him dost lie  
(A closet never pierc'd with crystal eyes);

---

<sup>36</sup> These are in the use of *traytye*, not *tractate*, in the entry for each of the four Books; *maners*, not *manere*, in II, ii (but the Ed<sup>2</sup> chapter heading also has *maners*, indicating the reading to be a "common sense" correction of the Ed<sup>1</sup> chapter heading text); *marchantes and chaungers*, not *marchants or changers*, in III, iv; *yssue of the alphyns*, not *yssuynge of the Alphyn*, in IV, iv.

But the defendant doth that plea deny  
 And says in him thy fair appearance lies.  
 To 'cide this title is impaneled  
 A quest of thoughts, all tenants to the heart,  
 And by their verdict is determined  
 The clear eye's moiety and the dear heart's part:  
 As thus—mine eye's due is thy outward part,  
 And my heart's right thy inward love of heart.<sup>1</sup>

The central imagery of this sonnet based upon a legal action for partition of land among co-owners has often been commented upon.<sup>2</sup> But for some reason the allusions to common law pleading and practice<sup>3</sup> therein have attracted almost no attention, being only casually mentioned when noted at all.<sup>4</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to inquire into the nature of these difficult (and therefore largely neglected) allusions in this highly legalistic sonnet.

## I

"But the defendant doth that plea deny"

When a lawyer thinks of a *plea*, invariably he thinks of the "answer" filed by the defendant to the plaintiff's *declaration* by which an action at law is commenced. In the technical and intricate art of pleading at common law, the first pleading in an action was the declaration<sup>5</sup> filed by the plaintiff. This was a formal statement

<sup>1</sup> Kittredge's reading, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (1936), p. 1501. And see generally *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare—The Sonnets* (ed. Rollins), pp. 127-129.

<sup>2</sup> See: Campbell, *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements Considered* (1859), p. 102; Allen, *Notes on the Bacon-Shakespeare Question* (1900), p. 81; Barton, *Links between Shakespeare and the Law* (1929), pp. 13 ff.; Hazelton Spencer, *The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* (1940), p. 28; Clarkson & Warren, *The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama* (1942), pp. 168-170.

<sup>3</sup> Elizabethan dramatists alluded to legal pleading with surprising frequency, as will be shown by citations hereinafter given to passages from their works which are suggested by the discussion of this sonnet.

<sup>4</sup> See: Davis, *The Law in Shakespeare* (2nd ed., 1884), p. 280; Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 81; *The Sonnets of Shakespeare* (ed. Tucker, 1924), p. 123.

<sup>5</sup> Declarations are referred to by the Elizabethan dramatists as follows: Chapman: *All Fools* (ed. Parrott, 1914), II, i, 329, IV, i, 305-332.

Webster (ed. Lucas, 1927): *The White Devil*, IV, i, 98; *A Cure for a Cuckold*, IV, i, 33-34, IV, i, 98.

Fletcher (with Massinger): *The Spanish Curate* (ed. Bullen, 1905), IV, vii, 74.

Middleton (ed. Dyce, 1840): *The Phoenix*, I, iv, pp. 328-329; *Any Thing for a Quiet Life*, II, i, p. 439.

to the court of the facts upon which he relied in invoking judicial process against the defendant. Following the declaration, it was the defendant's turn to make a statement answering the declaration. Two courses were open to him: he could file either a demurrer<sup>6</sup> or a plea.

The *plea* raised an issue of fact or presented new matters of fact which, unless a demurrer were interposed, had to be determined by trial. The *plea*, as a form of pleading, was exclusively adapted for use *by the defendant* in replying to a declaration, and with one exception<sup>7</sup> *was never used by the plaintiff*.

The pleadings subsequent to the plea, filed alternately by the plaintiff and defendant (assuming no intervening demurrer by either party), were in order: the replication, the rejoinder, the surrejoinder, the rebutter, and the surrebutter.<sup>8</sup> In actual practice

<sup>6</sup> The nature and general effect of a demurrer may be briefly described as follows: The demurrer raised a question of law as to the sufficiency of the preceding pleadings, both in form and in substance, to be decided by the judge. No issue of fact was involved. If the defendant demurred to a declaration, he said in effect, "Admitting the facts alleged in the declaration to be true, they do not show a cause of action against me"; or "The plaintiff has stated the facts in a manner contrary to the required form so that he is not entitled to proceed with his action." At common law the judgment on the demurrer was final and disposed of the action. Use of the demurrer was not confined to the defendant in replying to a declaration. It could be interposed by either party at any stage of the pleadings before an issue of fact had been joined. Thus, if the defendant elected not to demur to the declaration but to put in a plea, the plaintiff in turn could demur to the plea—and so on through the entire succession of pleadings.

Shakespeare does not mention demurrers at all, but his fellow dramatists allude to them as follows:

Beaumont & Fletcher: *The Woman's Prize* (ed. Dyce, 1844), II, i, p. 130.

Marston: *What You Will* (ed. Bullen, 1887), II, ii, 85.

Ford (eds. Gifford & Dyce, 1869): *Love's Sacrifice*, III, i, p. 56; *The Broken Heart*, II, ii, p. 246.

Middleton (ed. Dyce, 1840): *The Phoenix*, I, iv, p. 330, II, iii, pp. 364-367, IV, i, pp. 379-381; *A Fair Quarrel*, I, i, p. 458; *The Old Law*, I, i, pp. 9-10.

<sup>7</sup> In an action of replevin (for the specific recovery of chattels), if the defendant claimed the right to the chattels he alleged his right by a pleading known as an *avowry* or *cognizance*, which was in effect a declaration to which the plaintiff filed a plea as though he were a defendant.

<sup>8</sup> See 4 Coke's *Institutes*, 14; 3 Blackstone's *Commentaries*, 309-310.

Lest the reader gain the impression that pleading at common law was an unnecessarily tricky battle of wits utterly without relation to the



such pleadings seldom extended beyond the fourth stage before an issue of fact was joined.

It is at once apparent that line 7 of Sonnet XLVI does not square with this specialized definition of the term "plea." In the sonnet, the heart is the plaintiff and the eye is the defendant. Shakespeare does not have this defendant *file a plea* to the heart's declaration; he has the defendant *deny the plea* which must perforce have been filed *by the plaintiff*. It is obvious, therefore, that either (1) Shakespeare was here in error, or (2) he was using the word "plea" in some sense other than as the technical name of a particular pleading.<sup>9</sup> We think the line can be explained on the latter alternative consistently with seventeenth century legal usage.

Besides being the technical name of the defendant's answer to justice of the cause, we hasten to say that the purpose of pleading originally was to arrive at a *single* issue of law to be tried by the court, or a *single* issue of fact for the jury. A simple illustration will serve: *A v. X. Declaration* in an action of assumpsit for goods sold and delivered to the defendant's wife. *Plea*, that the wife was living apart from defendant and that defendant had notified plaintiff not to sell goods to his wife. *Replication*, that the goods were necessities. *Rejoinder*, that the wife was already sufficiently supplied. *Surrejoinder*, that the wife was not already sufficiently supplied, and the case is tried on that issue.

Following are instances in which these pleadings are referred to in the drama:

(a) Replication:—Shakespeare (ed. Kittredge, 1936): *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv, ii, 13-17; *Julius Caesar*, i, i, 48-52; *Hamlet*, iv, ii, 11-14. Chapman (ed. Parrott, 1914): *The Widow's Tears*, v, iii, 235-237; *All Fools*, ii, i, 309-335, iii, i, 405-411.

(b) Rejoinder:—Chapman: *The Widow's Tears*, v, iii, 235-237; *All Fools*, ii, i, 309-335, iii, i, 405-411, iv, i, 305-332. Beaumont & Fletcher: *The Woman's Prize* (ed. Dyce, 1844), ii, i, p. 130. Ford: *The Lady's Trial* (eds. Gifford & Dyce, 1869), iv, ii, p. 79.

(c) Sur-rejoinder:—Chapman: *All Fools*, iv, i, 305-332.

(d) Rebutter:—Chapman: *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* (ed. Parrott, 1910), v, v, 61-65.

\* Certainly such statements as the following, implying that the sonnet correctly portrays technical pleadings, are inaccurate and misleading: "There are regular Pleadings in the suit, the Heart being represented as Plaintiff and the Eye as Defendant." (Campbell, *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements Considered*, 1859, p. 102.) "From the *entering of the plea, denied by the defendant* [!], to the return of the verdict, this Sonnet shows a wonderful familiarity with legal proceedings in court, and follows the natural order of a trial at law." (White, *Commentaries on the Law in Shakespeare*, 2nd ed., 1913, p. 509.) [Italics added.]

the plaintiff's declaration, the term "plea" (1) was sometimes used to mean a legal "action" or suit, and (2) was also a generic term meaning a "pleading" filed by either party.

As to the first, we need only recall that all actions were classified as either *pleas* of the crown or common *pleas*, the former being actions prosecuted by the crown, and the latter ordinary civil actions.<sup>10</sup> Examples of this usage of the term "plea" are to be found in many of the common law forms of declaration. Thus a declaration in an action of trespass would begin: "John Doe, by A. B., his attorney, complains of Richard Roe, who has been summoned to answer the said plaintiff of a *plea* of trespass. . . ."<sup>11</sup>

For the second, authority contemporaneous with Shakespeare is found in Cowell's *Interpreter*,<sup>12</sup> in which "plea" is defined as follows:

"*Plea . . . commeth of the French (ploid. i. lis. controversia). It signifeth in our common lawe, that which either partie [italics added] alleadgeth for himselfe in court. And this was wont to be done in French from the Conquest untill Edward the 3. who ordeined them to be done in English. A. 36. cap. 15. . . .*"

The statute referred to by Cowell (36 Edward III, Statute 1, c. 15), passed in 1362, provided in part:

" . . . The King . . . hath ordained and stablished by the assent aforesaid, that all Pleas which shall be pleaded in any courts whatsoever . . . shall be pleaded, shewed, defended, answered, debated, and judged in the English Tongue, and that they be entered and inrolled in Latin."

Clearly, it is in this broader sense, embracing all the pleadings, that Shakespeare uses the term "plea" in this sonnet.<sup>13</sup> It is to

<sup>10</sup> See 3 Blackstone's *Commentaries*, 40. Cf. Sonnet xxxv, line 11.

<sup>11</sup> See *State v. Bacon et al.*, 27 R. I. 252, 61 Atlantic Reporter, 653 (1905), for a similar interpretation of the word "pleas" as used in the early English statute 33 Edw. I, St. 2 (1305).

<sup>12</sup> *The Interpreter or Booke Containing the Signification of Words: Wherein is set forth the true meaning of all, or the most part of such Words and Termes, as are mentioned in the Lawe Writers, or Statutes of this victorious and renowned Kingdome, requiring any Exposition or Interpretation*, Collected by John Cowell Doctor, and the Kings Maiesties Professor of the Ciuill Law in the Vniuersitie of Chambridge (1607).

<sup>13</sup> Some other instances in which the noun "plea" and the verb "plead" are used in the drama (often in a figurative sense) are the following:—Shakespeare (ed. Kittredge, 1936): *The Comedy of Errors*, III, i, 91-92;

be observed, moreover, that this interpretation is consistent with the obvious meaning of the verb "plead" in line 5.

II

"To 'eide this title is impanneled  
A quest of thoughts, all tenants to the heart."

The usual comment on these lines is simply that "quest" means a jury.<sup>14</sup> This superficial treatment (characteristic of the legal commentators as well as literary scholars) ignores the fact that the jurors, being "tenants to the heart" (the plaintiff in the action), had an interest in the issue. By present day standards of justice, such interested jurors would be subject to challenge and disqualification, and the most intriguing questions suggested by these lines are whether this was also true at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and, if so, why was it ignored by Shakespeare?<sup>15</sup>

There is ample and reliable authority that by Shakespeare's time it was well settled that jurors could be challenged for interest and other causes. Consideration of only two of these authorities will suffice.

Bracton, writing in the middle of the thirteenth century, says:<sup>16</sup>

*Henry V*, v, ii, 101; *III Henry VI*, i, i, 102-103; *Richard III*, i, iii, 85-87, iv, iv, 412-415; *Titus Andronicus*, i, i, 3-4. Chapman (ed. Parrott, 1914): *All Fools*, ii, i, 309-312. Dekker (Mermaid ed.): *II The Honest Whore*, iv, i, p. 253. Webster (ed. Lucas, 1927): *A Cure for a Cuckold*, iv, ii, 88-89. Greene (ed. Collins, 1905): *Orlando Furioso*, i, i, 129-133, 155-161. Peele (ed. Bullen, 1888): *David and Bethsabe*, Sc. vii, ll. 198-201. Lyly (ed. Bond, 1902): *The Maydes Metamorphosis*, i, i, 376-380. Ford (eds. Gifford & Dyce, 1869): *The Lady's Trial*, ii, iv, p. 44, iv, ii, p. 79. Middleton (ed. Dyce, 1840): *Women Beware Women*, iii, ii, p. 582. Massinger (ed. Gifford, 1813): *The Fatal Dowry*, iv, iv, p. 445; *The Roman Actor*, iv, iv, p. 406.

<sup>14</sup> *Sonnets* (ed. Malone, 1780), p. 269; *Sonnets* (ed. Dowden, 1885), p. 186; *Sonnets* (ed. Tucker, 1924), p. 123; *Sonnets* (ed. Rolfe), p. 145. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements Considered* (1859), pp. 102-103; Davis, *The Law in Shakespeare* (2nd ed., 1884), p. 280.

<sup>15</sup> Edw. J. White in his *Commentaries on the Law in Shakespeare* (2nd ed., 1913), p. 509, points out that these jurors "would be prejudiced jurors." John H. Senter in his *Was Shakespeare a Lawyer?* (1903), p. 28, says the jurors "were parties in interest with the plaintiff," and adds, "this would be a travesty on justice." There is no indication that these writers were considering the question from any point of view other than that of the present day. See also *Sonnets* (ed. Tucker, 1924), p. 123.

<sup>16</sup> *De Legibus*, folio 185, translated in Pound and Plucknett, *Readings on the History and System of the Common Law* (3rd ed., 1927), pp. 149-150.

But when they have come, exception may be taken in many ways against the jurors, for they can be repelled from taking the oath, in the same way as witnesses from giving testimony. Thus, an infamous person is repelled from taking the oath, to wit, a person who has been convicted of perjury, because he has lost his law. . . . Likewise, he is repelled who has made any claim of right in the thing concerning which he ought to swear. . . . Likewise if he be so under his [the party to the action] power, that he may be controlled or hurt or such like, as if he be in his household or so under his hand that he can be aggrieved in any way in regard of suits, services, or customs. . . . And it is to be known that if once they be chosen with the consent of the parties, they cannot be refused except on account of new and supervening cause.

Although Plucknett casts some doubt upon the reliability of Bracton's statement of the law, especially his importation of the law relating to witnesses,<sup>17</sup> it is certain that challenges for interest were firmly established prior to the seventeenth century. Sir Edward Coke, a contemporary of Shakespeare, lists<sup>18</sup> four kinds of challenges to the polls of the jury (i. e., exception to particular jurors as distinguished from a challenge to the array or whole panel<sup>19</sup>), one of which was a challenge *propter affectum* for suspicion of bias or partiality. The fact that a prospective juror was kin to either party, that he had an interest in the action, that he was a party's master, servant, counsellor, or steward, among other relationships, would support this challenge.

A party to a cause was not compelled to challenge a prospective juror who had an interest in the action. He could waive the right, and if he consented to the juror he could not later raise the objection. This was stated to be the law by Bracton and is still the law today.

Why, then, did Shakespeare choose to subject this "defendant" to a decision of an interested jury from whom a fair verdict could hardly be expected? Beyond question it was a deliberate choice because (a) the exclusion of interested jurors is a rule of simple

<sup>17</sup> *A Concise History of the Common Law* (2nd ed., 1936), p. 120.

<sup>18</sup> *Coke on Littleton*, 156-157. See also 3 Blackstone's *Commentaries*, 361-365, citing Coke.

<sup>19</sup> Challenges to the array or to the whole panel might be made on account of partiality or some default in the sheriff who arrayed the panel (3 Bl. Comm., 359). Thus if the sheriff, in order to favor the plaintiff, selected the whole panel from among the plaintiff's tenants, a challenge to the array would have been proper.

justice, fully appreciated by laymen without legal training, and (b) the fact that this jury was interested does not escape the reader and must certainly have been apparent to Shakespeare.

The first possible answer to suggest itself is that the choice may have been dictated by the limitations of meter, rime scheme, and number of lines inherent in the sonnet form. That theory has its attractions, but on close examination it does not appear to be a valid answer for a number of reasons. It is to be observed that the phrase "all tenants to the heart" ending line 10 is the *beginning* of a rime. In the rime scheme of the normal Shakespearean sonnet, line 10 ends in a new sound which rimes with the ending of line 12. Thus it is unlikely that when Shakespeare wrote line 10 the use of the word "heart" was suggested by the necessities of the rime. Further, the rime of this sonnet is a decided departure from the usual pattern. Here, instead of a new rime for the final couplet, the sounds (indeed the very words) ending lines 10 and 12 are repeated.

Another fact which should not be overlooked is that in line 10 Shakespeare follows the romantic notion that the seat of the thoughts is in the heart. There is ample evidence, however, that Shakespeare was aware of the function of the brain.<sup>20</sup> Undoubtedly it would have been possible for Shakespeare to keep the rime pattern of the sonnet regular, and at the same time to avoid both the interested jury and the romantic idea of the intellectual function of the heart. Disclaiming any intention whatever of improving the sonnet, the following may be suggested merely by way of illustration:

To 'cide this title is impaneled  
A quest of thoughts, all tenants to the *mind*,  
And by their verdict is determined  
*The portions to the eye and heart assign'd:*  
As thus: mine eye's due is thy outward part,  
And my heart's right thy inward love of heart.

It seems to us that the romantic idea of line 10 is the key to the problem. Of course Shakespeare knew his jury was interested. He may or may not have known that interested talesmen could be challenged and disqualified; that fact was unimportant for his purposes. He was writing romantic poetry—and *there* interested jurors may bring in a just verdict even if they cannot be trusted to do so

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, Sonnets L and LXXVII; *Macbeth*, v, iii, 37 ff.; *The Merchant of Venice*, I, ii, 19; *Hamlet*, III, iv, 137.

in actual practice! In fact the interested jury, far from being offensive, serves to heighten the poetic effect just as *dramatic* effect (not to say justice!) is served by Olivia's promise to the unfortunate Malvolio:

This practice hath most shrewdly pass'd upon thee;  
But when we know the grounds and authors of it,  
*Thou shalt be both plaintiff and the judge*  
*Of thine own cause.*<sup>21</sup>

PAUL S. CLARKSON  
CLYDE T. WARREN

1707 Lexington Building,  
Baltimore, Maryland

---

#### A SOURCE FOR MELVILLE'S *CLAREL*: DEAN STANLEY'S *SINAI AND PALESTINE*

When Melville went to Palestine in October, 1856, it was possible that he had already read one of the century's most popular descriptions of the region: Arthur Penhryn Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, which first appeared the preceding March. Whether or not he read it then, however, he did own a copy of the printing of 1863, inscribed with the date April 4, 1870.<sup>1</sup> And when *Clarel* was published in 1876 evidences of Stanley's book were scattered through its pages, many of them corroborated by the markings in Melville's copy.

Since the geographical scope of the book is, of course, greater than that of Melville's own journey, his most obvious borrowings in the poem are from those passages in Stanley which describe what he himself never saw. Lengthiest of all is the digression in *Clarel* on Petra, which is reminiscent of the report of the "*Petra Party*" Melville met in Jaffa.<sup>2</sup> The details of the picture, however, missing in Melville's journal, come from *Sinai and Palestine*.

Here Stanley insisted first of all upon the sombreness of Petra's coloring, contradicting the testimony of other travellers to its

<sup>21</sup> *Twelfth Night*, v, i, 360-363.

<sup>1</sup> Melville's copy is preserved in the Manuscript Room of the the New York Public Library.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal up the Straits* (New York, 1935), p. 68. There is no evidence in his journal or his correspondence that Melville visited Petra, to which he referred throughout his prose.



brightness. With all his predecessors he agreed as to the grandeur of the eastern approach to the city, through the famous *Sik* or cleft, but the picture with which he concluded was the temple El Deir on top of the western cliffs. For largely on the evidence of this structure's site he based his belief that Petra is ancient Kadesh.

To this theory Melville made no allusion in *Clarel*, though he did refer to it in the margin of his New Testament.<sup>8</sup> But like Stanley, whose words on the subject he underscored, he represented Petra as a place of shadows and of deep rather than dazzling colors; in Stanley's sequence he pictured first the cleft and then the temple of Petra; and all the while he echoed many of the actual words in the Dean's account. The conversants in the poem are the ex-sailor Rolfe, who has seen the city, and the optimistic Anglican priest, Derwent, who questions him about it.

*Clarel**Sinai and Palestine*

'The City Red in cloud-land lies  
Yonder . . .'

. . . the Red City . . . .

'Twas a new Jason found her out—  
Burekhardt, you know.' 'But tell.'

'The flume

Or mountain corridor profound  
Whereby ye win the inner ground

. . . like Burekhardt in modern  
times . . . .

. . . streaked and suffused with  
purple . . . .

Petraean; this, from purple gloom  
Of cliffs—whose tops the suns illumine  
Where oleanders wave the flag—  
Winds out upon the rosy stain,  
Warm colour of the natural vein,  
Of porch and pediment in crag.  
One starts. In Esau's waste are  
blent

. . . red and purple alternately . . . .

. . . purple variegations . . . .

. . . the flowering oleander . . . .

. . . light and rosy tint . . . .

. . . that extraordinary veining . . . .

Ionian form, Venetian tint

Statues salute ye from that fane,

. . . with Grecian façades.

The warders of the Horite lane . . . .

. . . a Greek Theatre . . . .

'But come,

. . . *Horite* habitations.

Imagine us now quite at home

You turn up a torrent-bed in the

Taking the prospect from Mount

western cliffs . . . into the vast

Hor.

cluster of rocks which face Mount

Good. Eastward turn thee—skip-

Hor on the north.

ping o'er

The walls of the interior of the Deir

The intervening craggy blight:

itself, as well as the steps, are

<sup>8</sup> Melville's New Testament is preserved in the Houghton Library at Harvard University.

*Clarel*

Mark'st thou the face of yon slab-  
bed height  
Shouldered about by heights? what  
Door

Is that, sculptured in elfin freak?  
The portal of the Prince o' the Air?  
Thence will the god emerge, and  
speak?

*El Deir* it is; and Petra's there,

Down in her cleft. Mid such a scene  
Of Nature's terror, how serene  
That ordered form. Nor less 'tis cut  
Out of that terror—does abut  
Thereon: there's Art.'

*Sinai and Palestine*

sculptured with the usual accom-  
paniments of these inscriptions—  
crosses and figures of the wild  
goat, or ibex.

The Arabic name, *El Deir* . . . .

. . . before you opens a deep cleft

. . . .

This is the *Sik*, or "cleft" . . . .

. . . the cleft being made by the rod  
of Moses . . . .

. . . I almost think one is more  
startled by finding in these wild  
and impracticable mountains a  
production of the last effort of a  
decaying and overrefined civili-  
sation, than if it were something  
which, by its better and simpler  
taste, mounted more nearly to  
the source where Art and Nature  
were one.

When Derwent proposes to enter this portal, Rolfe replies:

'Nay, forbear;

A bootless journey. We should wind  
Along ravine by mountain-stair—  
Down which in season torrents  
sweep—

Up, slant by sepulchres in steep,  
Grotto and porch, and so get near  
Puck's platform, and thereby *El*  
*Deir*.

We'd knock. An echo. Knock again—  
Ay, knock forever: none requite:  
The live spring filters through cell,  
fane,

And tomb: a dream the Edomite!'

. . . a precipitous ravine . . . .

. . . a continuous staircase . . . .

. . . the dry torrent . . . .

. . . the bed of the torrent . . . .

. . . numerous sepulchres . . . .

. . . a green platform . . . .

*This staircase is the most striking  
instance of what you see every-  
where. Wherever your eyes turn  
along the excavated sides of the  
rocks you see steps, often leading  
to nothing; or to something which  
has crumbled away . . . .*

. . . *Edomite habitations.*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Clarel* (Constable Edition, London, 1922-24), I, 298, 299; *Sinai and Palestine* (New York, 1863), pp. 88-92, 97, 98. Hereafter Stanley's book is referred to as Stanley. All the passages quoted from Stanley which are marked in Melville's copy are printed in italics; Stanley's italics are indicated by small caps.

Another necessarily borrowed picture in *Clarel* is the celebration of the Greek Easter, for the date of Melville's brief visit in Palestine was January. Three facts about it he apparently got from Stanley: the transportation of the fire from Jerusalem to Bethlehem by a horseman, the belief that the lamps over the Sepulchre were first lighted by angels, and the custom of the pilgrims to bathe and to dip their shrouds in the Jordan. These details, the first two marked in Melville's Stanley, are expatiated upon by Rolfe in the poem.<sup>5</sup>

In referring to the convent on Mount Hor Melville did not even pretend to give a direct account, as he did for Petra and the Greek Easter, but prefaced his description of the sunbeam which penetrates the Chapel of the Burning Bush once a year with the authority, "they tell." It was Stanley who told the story, one of the first to do so, for he noted that it "has not found its way into books."<sup>6</sup>

But Melville also relied on Stanley to help him describe places he too had seen: the "mountain town" of Jerusalem, which disappointed them both, the "purple . . . wall" which surrounded it, the "hamlet" of Bethany.<sup>7</sup>

' . . . she's not austere—[Judea] . . . Judah is the true climate of  
Nature has lodged her in good zone — the vine . . . .'<sup>8</sup>  
The true wine-zone of Noah . . . .'

' Look, by Christ's belfry set, . . . the minaret of Omar beside the  
Appears the Moslem minaret! ' Christian Belfry . . . .'<sup>9</sup>

Excellent then—as *there* bestowed— . . . the long descent of three thou-  
And true in charm the downward sand feet, by which the traveller  
road. "went DOWN" from Jerusalem

Quite other spells an influence throw . . . to Jericho. . . .<sup>10</sup>  
Down going, down, to Jericho.

' 'Tis Terra Santa—Holy Land: . . . the "terra damnata" of the  
Terra Damnata though's at hand Betrayal.<sup>11</sup>  
. . . .'

Are these throngs . . . the rich revenues of the mer-  
Merchants? [within the Sepulchre] chant Church of Armenia.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *Clarel*, II, 81, 82, 18; Stanley, pp. 463, 464, 308-310.

<sup>6</sup> *Clarel*, II, 20; Stanley, p. 46. See also Stanley's and Melville's citation of Josephus' testimony that a Divinity was thought to inhabit Sinai before the coming of the Israelites; their comparison of Judea to the Spanish table-lands, and of the palms of ancient Jericho to those of Memphis. (*Clarel*, I, 216, II, 159, I, 228; Stanley, pp. 48, 49, 171, 301.)

<sup>7</sup> *Clarel*, I, 6, 5, 4, 195; Stanley, pp. 169, 167, 166, 168.

<sup>8</sup> *Clarel*, II, 264; Stanley, p. 162. <sup>10</sup> *Clarel*, I, 197; Stanley, p. 416.

<sup>9</sup> *Clarel*, I, 123; Stanley, p. 455. <sup>11</sup> *Clarel*, I, 184; Stanley, p. 450.

<sup>12</sup> *Clarel*, I, 17; Stanley, p. 456. Compare also Melville's and Stanley's

Some of Stanley's geological as well as geographical descriptions of Palestine are also recognizable in *Clarel*; his belief, for instance, that Sodom was destroyed not by fire but flood:

<p>'Tut, tut—tut, tut. Of aqueous force, Vent igneous, a shake or so, One here perceives the sign . . . .'</p>	<p><i>The traces of igneous action on the granite rocks belong to their first upheaving. . . . Everywhere there are signs of the action of water, nowhere of fire.</i><sup>13</sup></p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The Dean's insistence upon the original verdure of the land also stirred Melville's imagination, picturing how the aboriginal hunter

<p>down the tube of fringed ravine Siddim descried, a liliated scene. . . .</p>	<p>. . . when Abraham and Lot looked down from the mountain of Bethel, on the deep descent beneath them. . . . "It was well watered every- where as the garden of the Lord. . . . ." <sup>14</sup></p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Interspersed with such scenes as these in *Sinai and Palestine*, of course, Melville found much Biblical history, some of which is also to be found in *Clarel*. He marked Stanley's tribute to Elijah and allusions to the brook Cherith, and on the title page of the book he wrote, "the Red City of Elijah the Gileadite"; in the poem it is Mortmain who is associated with the prophet, his Gilead and his Cherith.<sup>15</sup> Of other stories connected with certain localities Stanley certainly reminded Melville if he did not inform him: Joshua at Ai, David's flight through Bahurim, the healing of Naaman, Abraham entertaining angels under the oak of Mamre, the battle of the five kings.<sup>16</sup> Occasionally it is the same verse of Scripture which they quote: Abraham watching as "the smoke . . . went up" from the plain of Siddim, Matthew's "exceeding high" mountain of the temptation, Hosea's cryptic, "Out of Egypt have I called my son."<sup>17</sup>

descriptions of Jerusalem's ruins, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Damascus, Bethlehem, the Church of the Nativity. (*Clarel*, I, 39, 29, 30, II, 263, 264, 181, 209, 210; Stanley, pp. 118 ff., 182, 456, 303, 402, 104, 432, 433.)

<sup>13</sup> *Clarel*, I, 310; Stanley, p. 23.      <sup>14</sup> *Clarel*, II, 6; Stanley, p. 281.

<sup>15</sup> *Clarel*, I, 313, II, 56, 150; Stanley, pp. 299, 321.

<sup>16</sup> *Clarel*, I, 227, 203, II, 159, I, 260, 290, 291; Stanley, pp. 198, 199, 185, 303, 22, 103, 141, 282.

<sup>17</sup> *Clarel*, II, 7, I, 229, 127; Stanley, pp. 103, 130, xxvii. See also *Clarel*, I,

But Melville's purpose in *Clarel* was even less than Stanley's in *Sinai and Palestine* to write a historical guidebook, and some of the Dean's finer points he ignored altogether: his theory that Shaveh was on Mount Gerisim rather than on the Mount of Olives, where Melville placed it; his report that olive trees, which Melville said were extinct, were still to be seen at Bethany.<sup>18</sup> Rather Melville hoped, like other nineteenth century pilgrims, to discover the presence of a Divinity lingering in Palestine. His picture of that Divinity was, like Stanley's and Renan's, a romantic one with notable emphasis on Jesus' love of simple nature:

And, ay, He comes: the lilies blow!

...  
Who pleased Him so in fields and  
bowers,  
Yes, crowned with thorns, still loved  
the flowers. . . .

...  
Him following through the wilding  
flowers  
By lake and hill, or glad detained  
In Cana—ever out of doors. . . .

And if the beauty of nature attract  
His notice, it is still of the same  
simple and general kind,—the  
burst of the radiance of an east-  
ern sun,—the lively instincts and  
movements of the careless birds  
over His head,—the gay colours  
of the carpet of flowers under His  
feet. If there be any one passage  
of the older Scriptures which  
specially represents the natural  
storehouse of the Parables of the  
Gospel, it is the gentle and touch-  
ing burst of the imagery of spring  
in the Song of Songs: "The  
winter is past, the rain is over  
and gone; the FLOWERS appear on  
the earth; the time of the singing  
of BIRDS is come. . . ."<sup>19</sup>

But since the landscape of Palestine contrasted so grimly with this picture, Stanley had to conclude that the geography and the history of the Holy Land were "wholly without regard, perhaps even indifferent or hostile" to each other, and that the value of individual localities was "imaginative and historical, not religious."<sup>20</sup> And so Melville, too, conceded. For the geologist, Margoth, knows no Biblical history; searching for specimens he queries,

217, II, 247, I, 132, I, 7, 219, 186; Stanley, pp. 306, 207, 130, 190, xxxvii. On the last two of these pages Melville marked the Scriptural quotations which he too used.

<sup>18</sup> *Clarel*, I, 15, 195; Stanley, pp. 246, 184.

<sup>19</sup> *Clarel*, II, 31, I, 196, 254; Stanley, p. 425.

<sup>20</sup> Stanley, pp. 111, 192.

"Moses? who's Moses?"<sup>21</sup> And the pilgrims are convinced at the end of their journey that the spirit they seek is fled.

Thus Melville found in *Sinai and Palestine* not only confirmation of his own observations of the scene and support for his own spiritual longings, but a rationalization of the discrepancy between the reality and the ideal which he, too, tried to make. Like a true romantic, however, Melville remained unsatisfied with his result. To the orthodox Dean the wasteland of Palestine brought comfort and joy, since it supported the doctrine of the resurrection. But to Melville the flight of the god was always saddening and there is melancholy if not grief in Clarel's thought at the empty Sepulchre: "Not hearsed is He."<sup>22</sup>

NATHALIA WRIGHT

Maryville, College,  
Maryville, Tennessee

#### TRUMBULL AND GRAY'S *BARD*

The American poet John Trumbull is of course known to have been influenced by Gray's *Elegy*,<sup>1</sup> and his preference for that poem<sup>2</sup> seems to have caused critics to overlook his indebtedness to the *Odes*. There is, however, reason to believe that the *Bard* also made a marked impression on him, for several of his poems in situation and general tone bear a distinct resemblance to the *Bard*. The prophet in *The Destruction of Babylon* foretells with enthusiasm the downfall of his enemies, and Balaam, perched upon a crag above the armies of Israel, predicts the future at length in phraseology and versification which owe a noticeable debt to Gray's poem. Indeed, even the metrical resemblance between the *Bard* and the *Prophecy of Balaam* is marked. The stanzaic structure of the

<sup>21</sup> *Clarel*, I, 310.

<sup>22</sup> *Clarel*, I, 23.

<sup>1</sup> See Alexander Cowie, *John Trumbull, Connecticut Wit* (Chapel Hill, 1936), pp. 69, 147, 148; Leon Howard, *The Connecticut Wits* (Chicago, 1943), pp. 51, 52; Clare I. Cogan, "John Trumbull, Satirist," *The Colonade*, xiv (1919-1922), 83-84 (The Andiron Club of New York City, 1922). A standard edition of Trumbull's verse is printed in the last named volume.

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Cowie, "John Trumbull as a Critic of Poetry," *NEQ*, xi (1938), 788.



latter, although not as carefully worked out and consistent as Gray's, is an unmistakable imitation in its peculiar combination of long and short lines. In both poems the most casual examination will discover a very similar grouping of three, four, and five beat lines with a frequent use of a six beat line to close a stanza. The rime schemes also, although not identical, bear a superficial resemblance despite Trumbull's lack of consistency in every stanza, for among other similarities, both are frequently based upon the quatrain.

The tenor of the entire poem is reminiscent of the *Odes* generally and the *Bard* particularly in its brassy quality, vocabulary,<sup>3</sup> and use of personifications. Compare:

What echoing *terrors* burst upon mine ear!  
 What awful forms in flaming horror rise!  
 Empurpled Rage, pale Ruin, heart-struck Fear,  
 In *scenes* of blood ascend, and skim before my eyes.  
Balaam, Col., p. 490

and:

. . . What *terrors* round him wait!  
 Amazement in his van, with flight combin'd,  
 And sorrow's faded form, and solitude behind.  
Bard, ll. 60-62  
 Fell Thirst and Famine scowl. *Ibid.*, l. 81  
 . . . what solemn *scenes* . . .  
Descending slow. . . . Ibid., ll. 105-106

The vocabulary of much of Trumbull's verse shows his debt to the *Bard*: such words from the latter as *array*,<sup>4</sup> *sable*,<sup>5</sup> and *gore*<sup>6</sup> are common in his work. In using them Trumbull has found it possible to note and imitate certain typical constructions of the *Bard*. The use of an inverted sentence structure beginning with a

<sup>3</sup> Compare "On lofty Peor's *brow* / That *rears* its forehead . . ." (*Balaam, Colonnade*, p. 488) and "From Peor's high, illumined *brow*" (*ibid.*, p. 489) with "On a rock whose haughty *brow* . . ." (*Bard*, l. 15) and "Sublime their starry fronts they *rear*" (*ibid.*, l. 112). The italics in the quoted passages throughout this paper are mine.

<sup>4</sup> "The host of Israel stretch'd in deep *array*" (*Balaam, Col.*, p. 488); "He wound with toilsome march his long *array*" (*Bard*, l. 12).

<sup>5</sup> "And shrouds of *sable* wrap thee with the dead" (*Babylon, Col.*, p. 516); "Robed in the *sable* garb of woe" (*Bard*, l. 17); "Is the *sable* warrior fled? / . . . He rests among the dead" (*ibid.*, ll. 67-68).

<sup>6</sup> ". . . swam with sainted *gore*" (*Babylon, Col.*, p. 515); "Smear'd with *gore* . . ." (*Bard*, l. 36); "The bristled boar in infant-*gore*" (*ibid.*, l. 93).

key word he found particularly convenient when he encountered such lines of Gray's as "*Sublime* their starry<sup>7</sup> fronts they rear" (*Bard*, I, 112).<sup>8</sup>

*Sublime* the Muse shall lift her eagle wing:

*Future Glory of America*, Col., p. 497

*Sublime* the Prophet stood.

Beneath its pine-clad side,<sup>9</sup>

*Balaam*, Col. p. 488

Nor is it difficult to find other specific expressions<sup>10</sup> from the *Bard* which Trumbull has borrowed. "Visions" are perpetually "ascending" or "descending" before his prophets. The following four lines seem to have impressed him:

But oh! what solemn *scenes* on Snowdon's height

*Descending*<sup>11</sup> slow their glittering skirts unroll?

*Visions* of glory,<sup>12</sup> spare my aching sight.<sup>13</sup>

Ye *unborn ages* crowd not on my soul!

*Bard*, II. 105-108

A typical imitation is this:

Before his eyes eternal wonders roll,

Celestial *visions* open on his soul,

Unfolding skies the *scenes* of fate display,

And heaven *descending* in the beams of day.

*Babylon*, Col., p. 515

<sup>7</sup> "A starry crown invests . . ." (*Babylon*, Col., p. 515).

<sup>8</sup> Compare "*Fair* laughs the morn, and soft the zephyr blows" (*Bard*, I. 71) and "*Fair* as these vales, that stretch their lawns so wide, / As gardens smile in flow'ry meadows *fair*" (*Balaam*, Col., p. 489).

<sup>9</sup> ". . . Snowdon's shaggy *side*" (*Bard*, I. 11).

<sup>10</sup> Note Trumbull's acknowledged imitation: "And ancient *beards* and *hoary hair*, / Like meteors, *stream* in troubled air" (*M'Fingal*, Canto IV, Col., p. 385); "Loose his *beard*, and *hoary hair* / *Stream'd* like a meteor, to the troubled air" (*Bard*, II. 19-20).

<sup>11</sup> Note: ". . . for *visions* true / Again *ascending* wait thy view" (*M'Fingal*, IV, Col., p. 383); ". . . *scenes* of blood *ascend* . . ." (*Balaam*, Col., p. 490). See n. 14.

<sup>12</sup> ". . . the solar *glories* spread; / Her power, her *grace*, by circling worlds approved" (*Babylon*, Col., p. 515). Compare "Attemper'd sweet to virgin *grace*" (*Bard*, I. 118).

<sup>13</sup> "Spreads from the *aching sight*, and fades into the sky" (*Balaam*, Col., p. 488).

The line "Ye *unborn ages*<sup>14</sup> crowd not on my soul!" (*Bard*, l. 108) provides more than a hint for "And *unborn ages* view the ripen'd day" (*Future Glory of America, Col.*, p. 496). Furthermore, Trumbull's "And see, *bright Judah's Star ascending / Fires the east with crimson day*" (*Balaam, Col.*, p. 489) seems to be a combination of at least two passages from the *Bard*: "Tho' fann'd by Conquest's *crimson wing*" (l. 3) and "In yon *bright track*, that *fires the western skies*" (l. 103). Finally we may add that

The boast of genius and the pride of praise,  
Gay pleasure's charms *by fairy fancy dress'd*,  
*Youthful Expectations, Col.*, p. 500

is clearly indebted to

Fierce war, and faithful love,  
And truth severe, *by fairy fiction drest*.  
*Bard*, ll. 126-127

In the trend from "neo-classical" to "romantic" taste such evidence as this has a certain interest. Although Trumbull has not taken over the Celtic and medieval aspects which appealed to Gray, Macpherson, and Blair, he has been strongly influenced by the versification, situation, and rather extravagant diction of a poem which contained those elements to a high degree. Surely if this holds true of a colonial American poet, we may wonder if such poetry as the *Bard* did not find a wider and more appreciative audience in the late eighteenth century than has been assumed by many.

H. W. STARR

*Temple University*

### QUESTIO QUID IURIS

For all but two centuries and a half, editors of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, from Thomas Tyrhwitt through Fred Norris Robinson, have struggled vainly to extort a meaning from the three words in Latin which appear in line 646 of the *Prologue*. The trouble is that very often it is not possible to understand Latin

<sup>14</sup> "The years *unborn ascend to sight*; / He saw their opening *morn arise*" (*Balaam, Col.*, p. 488). Compare also: "Gone to salute the *rising morn*" (*Bard*, l. 70).

words when they have been removed from their context. It is the purpose of this paper to point out that the context of the words quoted by Chaucer is an ancient writ current in English law from about 1300 or so for several hundred years. A specimen to serve as a model for persons who needed to utter this writ is to be found in the great collection of the forms of writs issued under a variety of authors' names or anonymously with a title like *Natura brevium* some twoscore times between 1494 and 1635. Lord Coke says that this collection is "right profitable," and it is indeed so for us, because at fo. clxii of the edition of [1545?] the following pertinent materials appear:

Brief [= writ] de quid iuris clamat est tiel Rex vic[ecomiti] salutem. Prec[imus] tibi quod distringas A. per omnia terr[arum] et catellum etc. Et quod de exit. etc. Et quod habeas corpus eius cora[m] Justiciariis nostris apud westm[onasterium] tali die etc. ad cognoscend[um] quid iuris clamat in uno mesuagio cu[m] pertin[entibus] in curia nostra concessit K. per fine[m] inter cos[ignatores] fact et ad audiend[um] etc. etc.

Cest briefe gist lou ieo graunt le revercion de montena[n]t a termede vie a un ho[mm]le p[ro] fyne leve en la court le roy, et le tenant ne voet mie attuner, celuy a q[ui] le revercio[n] est graunt ava[nt] cest brief luy chace dattourner, Et nota que si le tenant a terme d[e] vie clayme revers[ion] p[ro] celuy que ad graunt a terme de son vie donques il serra chace d'attourner, mez si le [?] clayme dauer fee simpl[e] en lez tenementes, soit trouve que il nad pas fee simple, il perdra s[e]s[in] de la t[er]re. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The discussion of the writ is continued through another long paragraph, but the material quoted is ample to show that there was once a writ which was designated by its first three words, *quid iuris clamat*. The Law French goes on to say that the writ was used to summon before a court that man who had refused to comply with a decision concerning title, which decision had been previously rendered.

The summoner knows no more of the technicalities of the law—"this elvysh nyce lore"—than the Canon's Yeoman knows about the theory of alchemy.<sup>2</sup> How the dolt had learned even these scrappy fragments Chaucer tells us explicitly in 11. 639 ff:

<sup>1</sup> Almost the same text appears on fo. 166, v<sup>o</sup> of the edition of 1534.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my paper on the Canon's Yeoman's prologue and tale, in "Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*," pp. 685-698 (Chicago, 1941).

A few termes hadde he, two or thre,  
That he had lerned out of some decree—  
No wonder is, he herde it al the day;

The words which the summoner parrots uncomprehendingly have been understood no better than he did simply because we have not known that these tags of Latin had been picked up in the courtroom by the summoner because he had heard them repeated a score of times daily, whenever a new case came up relating to the efforts of a plaintiff to enforce a defendant to comply with a decision already rendered. Nowadays, the business might be begun thus: "N is summoned to show cause for failure to comply;" or "to show reason why he should not be held in contempt of court because . . ." It is obvious that such a writ would be in very frequent use in a day when the power to enforce a decision of this kind lay almost exclusively in the hands of the plaintiff. This situation was even more striking in those courts of canon law in which the summoner was active, for by the end of the fourteenth century the weakening of the power of courts of canon law had progressed notably.

The valiant efforts of editors of Chaucer to wring a meaning of some kind from these puzzling words have failed for the very human reason that anybody who knows some Latin can hardly refrain from reading the obvious modern meaning into ancient Latin words. Who can resist rendering the word *Questio* in line 646 by modern English "question"? Not wishing to appear to cast contumely on my betters, I restrict myself to quoting an expert in the history of English law on this sort of thing:

Some technical phrases and the names of writs and other processes were untranslatable except at the risk of ridicule. How could *nisi prius, quare impedit, fieri facias, habeas corpus*, [or *ne exeat*] be done into decent English? The later statute allowed such expressions to remain in their Latin dress.<sup>a</sup>

It is plain that we should do well to imitate the discretion of "the later statute" by leaving the Summoner's tipsy mumblings in their duly impressive Latin, just as we do today with a writ *ne exeat* (pronounced in my hearing by lawyers today as if spelled *knee exyat*, the final syllable to rhyme with *hat, cat, mat*), re-

<sup>a</sup> Percy H. Winfield, *The chief Sources of English legal History*, Cambridge [Mass.], 1925, p. 14.

cognizing that the legalistic jargon has its own unique value when its frame of reference is understood clearly.<sup>4</sup>

Even at this late date, we cannot yet say of Chaucer what an Abbott of Mont St.-Michel said sagely of Vacarius, that he was "Vir honestus et juris peritus," but one day the time will come when it can be said in sober truth.

JOHN W. SPARGO

Northwestern University

### SPANISH SANTURRÓN

This word looks like a mere Spanish derivative from *santo* 'saint.' All scholars have taken it to be so, e. g. Hanssen, *Gramm.*, § 378. But let us remark that while Hanssen has collected a good many derivatives in *-arrón* (*nubarrón*, *ventarrón*, *vozarrón*, *abejarrón* etc.), this is the only case he has found of a suffix *-urrón*. This very isolation was the reason for this foreign word being transferred to the more copious class of the words in *-arrão* when it was adopted into Portuguese: *santarrão*.

Surely enough we can perceive now in *santurrón* a kind of Spanish suffix *-urrón*, but even that is only a secondary result, since the original form was *\*santorón*. Our word is cognate to obsolete French *santoron*, and there can be little doubt that the Spanish-Portuguese forms come from French, since in this language the word appears about two hundred years before Spanish *santurrón*; the earliest known occurrence of the latter is in Padre Isla, while in French we have it, with the same meaning of 'religious hypocrite,' in La Fontaine, in Cotgrave and in Rabelais,<sup>1</sup> that great flagellator

<sup>4</sup> In the same twilight zone of the obscure meanings of legalistic terms in Law Latin or Law French wander my paper, "Chaucer's Love-Days," in *Speculum* xv (1940), pp. 36-55, and *Juridical Folklore in England*, (Durham, N. C., 1944).

<sup>1</sup> See Sainéan, *La Langue de Rabelais*, II, 267, and cf. Spitzer, *BhZRP* xxix, 35n. Littré, in the text of his dictionary, catalogues *santoron* as a variant of *santon* 'Moslem hermit'; he follows thereby the example of Le Loyer, *Discours et Histoire des Spectres*, Paris 1605. This identification, apparently secondary,—*santon* is, on the contrary, a Hispanicism in French and English—is not confirmed semantically by the text of Rabelais, our most reliable authority; but it may be regarded as an indirect proof of



of all sorts of hypocrisy, who mentions the *santorons* among a whole gang of boon companions:

Hypocrites, hydropiques, patenostriers, chattemittes, *santorons*, cagots, hermites

*Quart Livre*, chap. 64 (a similar passage in the *Pantagruéline Prognostication*, chap. 5).

Now here we have a specimen of the Old French way of pronouncing Lat. *-um* as *-on*: *santoron* is evidently the Latin genitive *sanctorum*, which in medieval French occurs with this spelling and with the meaning "argent recueilli dans les troncs de tel ou tel saint" (Godefroy).<sup>2</sup> Perhaps we could trace the Rabelaisian *santoron* to this meaning, referring to the vulgar accusation, brought against church people, according to which they are in the habit of taking this money; but a more probable explanation would be that it is a direct application of the Latin word *sanctorum* in one of the meanings admitted by Littré in his Supplement: either because this word is often repeated in his prayers, or because pseudo-religious people like to be regarded as saints.<sup>3</sup> Actually *-orum* does not act here as a genitive ending but rather as a kind of pejorative suffix employed popularly as typical for ecclesiastical things and persons connected therewith, who are always resorting to Latin and to Latin phrases; such a suffix as appears in the popular Spanish word *latinórum* = *latinajo* 'a phrase or word in dog Latin.'

The word might have been adopted into Spanish during the Middle Ages, at the same time as the Cluny monks were entering

the popularity of *santoron* in XVIth and XVIIth Century French, where this word and the foreign *santon* were confused. The passage in La Fontaine (*Épître XXIII*, éd. Régnier, p. 207), strongly ironical, has *santoron* probably in the same meaning as in Rabelais, of whom it is apparently a mere reminiscence. As to Cotgrave, his words are clear: "A hypocrite or a counterfeiter of saints."

<sup>2</sup>In Portuguese *sanctorum* or *santoro* means 'blessed bread' (Figueiredo) or 'present given by the Godfather to his Godchild in All-Saints' day' (*RLus.*, II, 252).

<sup>3</sup>"Unus e sanctorum numero," as Cotgrave suggested. The following passage by Peire Cardenal may be quoted in support of this theory: "Li clerc si fan pastor / e son aucizedor / e semblan de *sanctor*; / quan los vey revestir, / e pren m'a souvenir / de n'Alengri, q'un dia / volc ad un parc venir, / mas pels cas que temia, / pelh de mouton vestic, / ab que los escarnic; / puey mangle e trahic / selhas que·l abellic" (Appel, *Chrest.*, 76. 3).

Spain, and the Galice road was crowded with pilgrims; it was the time when so many ecclesiastical gallicisms and provençalisms were introduced: *fraile, monje, canonjía, deán, preste, hereje, chantre, manteo, maitines, oblea* etc., and the obsolete *milagre* (miracle), *convente, maison* 'monastery' (Menéndez Pidal, *Orig.*, 78 and 576). But as the oldest attestation of *santurrón* recorded by the *Diccionario de Autoridades* belongs to the XVIIIth. Century, it is more probable that its introduction was later, contemporary with the adoption of such a word as Astur. *freru* "corredor de iglesias que pide para un santo que lleva en una urna" (Rato).

Another Spanish adaptation of the same word can be traced to a somewhat earlier date. *Santulón* appears in *La Cueva de Salamanca*, I, sc. ii, of Ruiz de Alarcón; and to-day this form is preserved in Argentina, Chile, Peru, Ecuador and Central America (Lemos, *Semántica*; Malaret, *Supl.*). This form has an *l* < Fr. *r*, as in *charnela* < *charnière*, and the doublets *santulón*—*santurrón* are comparable to Sp. *peluca*—Cat. *perruca* < Fr. *perruque*. In Portuguese, *santilão* is attested by Fr. Amador Arraes, according to Moraes.<sup>4</sup>

HORTENSIA COROMINAS  
JOHN COROMINAS

Barcelona  
The University of Chicago

---

<sup>4</sup> Any connection between *santurrón* and the word *xanturero* (or *xanturero*) of the *Poema de Yúçuf*, A 60b, is more than doubtful; its favorable meaning ('saint'? 'santon'?) leads us very far from our word: "Kuando entronon por la billa, lax jentex xe marabellaban; / el día era nublo i el [Yúçuf] lo aklaria . . . Dizien todax lax jentex ad akel merkader / xe yera anjel o onbre o xanturero." There is also an *Aben Xantair* from Toledo, Xth. Century, in Menéndez Pidal, *Orig.*, p. 102. Phonetically *xanturero* comes nearer to *santulario*, as found in Spanish ballads (Pagès) and to-day in Cuba and Colombia, but *santulario* has also the pejorative meaning (Martínez Moles: "*santulario, santurrón*"; Sundheim: "*santulario, santurrón, nimio en los actos de devoción; según Cejador vale en España supersticioso en venerar cosas*"; Pagès: "*santularia, santurrona*"). In any case *santulario* has nothing to do with *santurrón*. It is merely an alteration of *santuario*: Cat. *santuari* is attested in the XVIth Century with the same meaning (see Aguiló), and O. Fr. *saintuaire* is a synonym of 'saint'. For the insertion of the *-l-*, cf. \*APTUARIUM > Arag. *atulario* (Spitzer, *Anales del Inst. de Ling. de Cuyo*, III, 2).

THE TERM 'LANGUAGE' IN *LE PELERINAGE DE CHARLEMAGNE*

Professor Leo Spitzer has maintained that *li language*, as used in *Le Pelerinage de Charlemagne*, is an Occidental counterpart in the middle of the twelfth century of an expression known previously in The Near East.<sup>1</sup> The transcription of line 209 is "car li language i uenēt de trestute la uile" according to J. Koch.<sup>2</sup> The setting for the passage is a bazar near the church of Sainte-Marie-Latine, which received that name because it was occupied by Latin monks prior to the Crusades.<sup>3</sup> The first interpretations had shown that the term refers to people: "nations speaking different languages," given by Michel in his 1836 edition; "ceux qui parlent les langues étrangères," adopted by Godefroy, IV, p. 713b; "Leute verschiedener Zunge," proposed by Koschwitz-Thurau in their 1923 edition.<sup>4</sup> Spitzer concluded that *li language* designates "the foreign national groups."<sup>5</sup>

The verse 213 is the only passage wherein the poet waxes personal (if we overlook verse 860, which is a mere bit of padding); he does so as a result of his mistaken notion that the merchants display their cloth and their spices right inside the church. Long ago, Gaston Paris<sup>6</sup> argued that it was exclusively upon Moslems that the poet calls down the wrath of the Lord, and Spitzer takes the same attitude. On the other hand, Gautier, the editors, and Heinemann took issue with Gaston Paris, and saw in the verse a threat against the Christian natives.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *MLN*, LIII (1938), 20-21.

<sup>2</sup> There was only one manuscript, and it was lost in 1879; cf. *Romania*, LXIV (1938), 102.

<sup>3</sup> Sources for this appellation are indicated by A. Beugnot, *Assises de Jerusalem*, II (Paris, 1843), 536.

<sup>4</sup> An obvious case of confusion worse confounded is the double translation, "people of all tongues," and "tongues of different peoples," offered for the text and then for the glossary by A. J. Cooper, *Le Pelerinage de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1925), pp. 13 and 86, and by K. Voretzsch, *Einführung in das Studium der altfrz. Sprache* (Halle, 1932), pp. 255 and 393.

<sup>5</sup> This definition was repeated by the late R. C. Bates, *Yale Rom. Studies*, XVIII (1941), p. 36.

<sup>6</sup> *Romania*, IX (1880), p. 25.

<sup>7</sup> L. Gautier, *Les Epopées fran.*, III (Paris, 1880), 273; E. Koschwitz—G. Thurau, *Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel* (Leipzig, 1923), 66; T. Heinemann, *Zts. rom. Phil.*, LVI (1936), 535.

In order to arrive at a valid definition of the word, it behooves us to see how it applies to inhabitants of places other than Jerusalem. It referred to the Knights Hospitallers on the Island of Rhodes, as Spitzer discovered in a recent issue of the *Guide Bleu*. They were first organized into separate nationalities in 1323 under the Grand Master Helion de Villeneuve.<sup>8</sup> In 1530 the Order of Saint John was forced to move to the Island of Malta.<sup>9</sup> It seems to me, however, that the application of *language* to "a national or provincial group within a religious and military order" is not the original idea but rather a specific transferral. If I am justified in my contention, then the expression is not to be treated as an echo of the polyglot Orient. Therein lies the gravamen of this investigation. This word-study reveals rather a literal translation of the Biblical equivalent, as has been proposed vaguely by the *NED*.<sup>10</sup>

Du Cange devotes the first part of his article on *lingua* to the mediaeval usage of the French term as a synonym for the Latin *natio*, which he correlates with *γλῶσσα*. This Hellenistic word was introduced in the Septuagint metonymically to denote people speaking a distinct language. The ultimate origin, however, is the Hebrew *לשון*, as used in Isaiah LXVI 18.<sup>11</sup>

In a sequel to the article under discussion, *MLN*, LIII (1938), 553, Mrs. Grace Frank and Miss R. Burkart also decline to limit the threat to Moslems.

<sup>8</sup> F. C. Woodhouse, *The Military Religious Orders of the Middle Ages* (London, 1879), pp. 59 and 135.

<sup>9</sup> L. Sainéan, *La Langue de Rabelais*, II (Paris, 1923), 289, treats the expression "tous peuples, toutes nations, . . . toutes langues" as a "synonymie commune à plusieurs idiomes," and he quotes the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*: "*langue* se prend aussi quelquefois, comme dans l'ordre de Malthe, pour la nation." Even though Sainéan, *ibid.*, p. 560, G. F. Burguy, *Gram. langue d'oïl*, III (Leipzig, 1856), 219, and others accept the definition "nation," it is too sweeping. The *languages* of Malta include the four nations, France, Italy, Germany, England, but they also embrace the four provinces, Auvergne, Provence, Aragon, Castille. The same denotation is implied in the name Languedoc.

<sup>10</sup> The *NED* adduces the earliest English example of *tongue* [in sense 9] in the 1382 version of the Holy Bible which John Wycliffe made from the Latin Vulgate, Daniel V 19, and the first example of *language* [in sense 5] as a variant in his 1388 version, while starting the history of the synecdoche with the *Cyclopædia* of Ephraim Chambers in 1727. These words, consequently, entered the English language long after the cognate words became current in French.

<sup>11</sup> M. H. Bresslau, *Hebrew and English Dictionary* (London, 1855), s. v.:

Now if we assemble the relevant examples of Du Cange, *ibid.*, and those of La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, VII pages 143b and 145a, we find *langage* used in the *Roman de Garin le Loherain*, *Assises de Jerusalem*, *Chroniques* of Froissart, and *langue* used in the *Assises de Jerusalem*,<sup>12</sup> *Chronique de Nangis*, a document of 1348, *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris*, *Lucidaire*. An earlier example is *langage* in the *Conte del Graal* by Chrestien de Troyes,<sup>13</sup> but the oldest one has been given as our point of departure: *li langage* in *Le Pelegrinage de Charlemagne*. In all of these ten instances, *langage* or *langue* is a generic term used anent "any community of people having a language of its own."

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

---

#### SAMUEL ROGERS'S APPROACH TO THE BLANK-VERSE DRAMATIC MONOLOGUE

It is surprising that no Browning scholar has observed how closely some of the tales in Rogers's *Italy* (1822) approach Brown-

"generally speech, language, and in the latter sense used for people with a distinct language." Although this Hebrew word is not mentioned in the list compiled by D. S. Blondheim, *Les Parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina* (Paris, 1925), pages xlvi-lxviii, his documentation is ample to prove that certain passages of the *Vetus Latina* reflect the Hebrew original with or without the intermediary of the Septuagint; cf. J. Trénel, *L'Ancien Testament et la langue fran. du moyen âge* (Paris, 1904), p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> Beugnot, I, p. 212, based his edition on the manuscript of Venice: "est en la merci dou seignor de perdre quanque il a et la laingue aussi." He commented upon the thought that a plebeian might suffer loss of his tongue as well as loss of all his wealth for failure to employ the town crier [cf. II, pp. 29 and 203]. Apparently Littré, III, p. 249b, also saw an anatomical term in the edict. On the other hand, Du Cange, who read the manuscript of Dupuy, adopted the variant: "quanque il y a en la langue." The punishment would thus entail loss of all that which the plebeian owns in the province.

<sup>13</sup> G. Baist and A. Hilka, *Der Percevalroman* (Halle, 1932), verse 8178. It is defined as "Volksstamm" by W. Foerster and H. Breuer, *Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes' Sämtlichen Werken* (Halle, 1933), s. v.

ing's monologues in blank verse, the earliest of which were published in *Men and Women* (1855). Rogers's purpose was not to reveal his speakers' characters, which revelation was, of course, Browning's chief interest; nor did Rogers endeavor to resuscitate the spirit of Renaissance Italy, or to bring into poetry an invigoratingly fresh conversational style. *Italy's* lines are metrically as impeccable as those of *Human Life* (1819); its diction is as neo-classically exact as that of *The Pleasures of Memory* (1792). Yet the form or at least two of *Italy's* non-autobiographical relations, "Monte Cassino," and "An Adventure," distinctly parallel the form of the Browning blank-verse monologue.

"An Adventure," like any Browning monologue, pitches without preface into action, the first detail implying clearly the conversation which has preceded the moment of beginning.

Three days they lay in ambush at my gate,  
Then sprung and led me captive. Many a wild  
We traversed, but Rusconi, 'twas no less,  
Marched by my side, and —" etc.

The concluding lines, reminding the reader of the listener's presence, neatly frame the monologue.

Ere his tale was told,  
As on the heath we lay, my ransom came;  
And in six days, with no ungrateful mind,  
Albert was sailing on a quiet sea.  
—But the night wears, and thou art much in need  
Of rest. The young Antonio, with his torch,  
Is waiting to conduct thee to thy chamber.

"Monte Cassino" is told by a Benedictine monk. Again, the opening lines, which, although introducing two speakers, could as easily have been spoken by one (the listener's question being echoed by the monk), suggest as adroitly the situation and the actions that have gone before as the opening lines of *Bishop Blougram's Apology*, or of *Fra Lippo Lippi*.

It is by no means the intention of this note to suggest that Browning conceived the idea of a dramatic monologue in blank verse from the selections considered here. I wish only to point out as a fact



deserving notice that Samuel Rogers's *Italy* anticipated the blank-verse dramatic monologue which Browning developed into a mature form.<sup>1</sup>

RICHARD R. WERRY

Wayne University

### NEVIZANUS, ARIOSTO, FLORIO, HARINGTON, AND DRUMMOND

Sir John Harington indicates his sixteenth Epigram as "translated out of Casaneus his Catalogus gloriae mundi." The Latin is found in Part 2, Consideration 22: "Mulier propter eius pulchritudinem, & formositatem laudanda est," p. 51v of the edition of Venice, 1576:

Triginta haec habeat, quae vult formosa vocari  
Femina, sic Helenam fama fuisse refert.  
Alba tria, & totidem nigra, & tria rubra puella,  
Tres habeat longas res, totidemq'; breves.  
Tres crassas, totidem graciles, tria stricta, tot ampla;  
Sint ibidem huic formae, sint quoq'; parva tria.  
Alba cutis, nivei dentes, albique capilli,  
Nigri oculi, cunus, nigra supercilia.  
Labra, genae atque vngues rubri, sit corpore longa,  
Et longi crines, sit quoque longa manus.  
Sintq'; breves dentes, auris, pes, pectora lata.  
Et clunes, distent ipsa supercilia.  
Cunus, & os strictum, stringunt ubi cingula, stricta:  
Sint coxae, & collus, vulvaq; turgidula.  
Subtiles digiti, crines, & labra puellis.  
Parvus sit nasus, parva mamilla, caput.  
Cum nullae aut rae sint hae, formosa vocari  
Nulla puella potest, rara puella potest.

As Cassaneus indicates, he found the poem in the *Sylva Nuptialis* of Johannes Nevizanus (Nevizzano), first published in 1516.

<sup>1</sup>S. S. Curry in his consideration of the history of the monologue (*Browning and the Dramatic Monologue*, Boston, 1908, 113-132) treats as logical antecedents of the form "monologue lyrics," and cites as specimens Marlowe's *The Passionate Shepherd to His Love*, Drayton's "Come, let us kiss and part," other Elizabethan lyrics, and many of Burns' poems, notably "John Anderson, my Jo" and "Afton Water." Certainly, "Monte Cassino" and "An Adventure" bear more resemblance to the Browning monologue than any lyric does.

Harington was not the first to present this poem in England. In 1591 it was printed in a free Italian version, accompanied by a closely parallel English translation, in the *Second Frutes* of John Florio (pp. 130-131), with no acknowledgment of indebtedness. There seems to be no reason to suspect any influence of Florio's version on Harington. In the *Second Frutes*, Florio uses other borrowed matter without acknowledgment, though I have observed no other instance so striking as this.

In 1614 (?) William Drummond published among his *Madrigalls and Epigrams* fourteen lines in couplets entitled *Beauties Idea*. This is a rendering of Nevizanus' poem, with the omission of the first six lines, except for their reference to Helen, and of the last two. Drummond applies his verses to Chloris "my Hope, and only Joy," and brings in also a reference to Venus. Otherwise he follows his original closely, though with rearrangement of material.<sup>1</sup> *Beauties Idea*, then, should be added to the list of Drummond's translations.<sup>2</sup>

The poem evidently belongs to the tradition of describing by enumeration of which Lessing wrote in the *Laocoon*, chap. 20. Indeed Lessing's chief instance, Ariosto's Alcina (*Orlando Furioso* 7. 11-15), has some of the qualities of Nevizzano's lady. She has white teeth, breast, neck, and hand. Though her hairs are blonde (not quite *albi*), her eyes and brows are black. Her cheeks and mouth are red. *Augusta* applied to her body may be interpreted as long, and her hand and hair are long. Her foot is short, her hand slender, and her breast *largo*, equivalent to *pectora lata*. Perhaps both descriptions owe something to a common convention.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

<sup>1</sup> In his note on the poem, L. E. Kastner, following Wm. C. Ward (*Poems of Drummond*, New York, 1894, vol. 1, p. 164), writes of line 3: "*White is her Haire*, etc.: both the edition of 1616 and the one privately issued in 1614 read '*Haire*' in this line. This is obviously incorrect; probably *Hand* should be read" (*The Poetical Works of Drummond*, Manchester, 1913, p. 232). But *Haire* is correct, being a translation of *capilli*. It is curious, however, that in line 6 Drummond renders *pes* as *Bellie* (1616) and *Wombe* (1614, 1656 and 1659, 1711); is it a mere slip or did he have an incorrect text of the original?

<sup>2</sup> Kastner (ed. cit., l. xxx) does not list Nevizanus among Drummond's neo-Latin sources.

## EASTWARD HO! AND A WOMAN IS A WEATHERCOCK

Predicting a dire future for the prodigal Quicksilver, the upright Golding in *Eastward Ho!* declares:

... methinks I see thee already walking in Moorfields without a cloak, with half a hat, without a band, a doublet with three buttons, without a girdle, a hose with one point and no garter, with a cudgel under thine arm, borrowing and begging threepence.<sup>1</sup>

This is but part of a longer speech; and since it is static rather than dramatic, from the point of view of an actor it might effectively be cut. Who the initial actor was we do not know, but it may well have been Nathan Field, a principal member of the Queen's Revels which in 1605 first produced the play<sup>2</sup> and of the Lady Elizabeth's men who retained the play and later revived it.<sup>3</sup> Whether or not Field played the part of Golding, he undoubtedly was familiar with the play.<sup>4</sup> He seems, moreover, to have remembered this speech when in 1609 he wrote his *A Woman Is a Weathercock*. In that play the vindictive Captain Pouts, having been wounded by Strange for slandering Kate, cries:

'Zoons! methinks I see myself in Moorfields, upon a wooden leg, begging threepence.<sup>5</sup>

This passage W. C. Hazlitt and John Payne Collier have connected with the disguised Brainworm in *Every Man in His Humour*; but Hazlitt is clearly wrong in saying that Field's passage "is only copied from a situation given to Brainworm,"<sup>6</sup> just as Collier is wrong in saying that Brainworm is represented upon a wooden leg.<sup>7</sup> It seems clear that the Field passage is a borrowing from

<sup>1</sup> I, 1: 177 ff.; *English Drama 1580-1642*, ed. Brooke and Paradise (New York, 1933).

<sup>2</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), III, 254-256.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 255.

<sup>4</sup> He may even have been imprisoned for appearing in it; his biographer, indeed, says "we may safely assume" that he was [R. Florence Brinkley, *Nathan Field, the Actor Playwright* (New Haven, 1928), p. 26].

<sup>5</sup> IV, 2; p. 396, ed. A. W. Verity in *Nero and Other Plays* (London, 1888).

<sup>6</sup> *Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England* (London, 1866), IV, 40.

<sup>7</sup> See *Every Man in*, 1616 version, II, 5: 100; *Ben Jonson*, ed. Herford and Simpson (Oxford, 1925—).

*Eastward Ho!*, one which apparently has not been noticed by editors of *Eastward Ho!*<sup>8</sup> or *A Woman Is a Weathercock*,<sup>9</sup> or by commentators<sup>10</sup> who might have been interested in it. The borrowing is, of course, slight indeed; but it may possibly have significance. It may show the actor-playwright remembering a passage which had proved effective in the theatre and, with the actor's awareness of the audience pulse, ruthlessly cutting away its impedimenta.

WILLIAM PEERY

University of Texas

#### A NOTE ON OTTO LUDWIG'S *HEITERETEI*

Otto Ludwig's *Heiteretei*, whose name serves as the title of the story,<sup>1</sup> is a tall, strong and at the same time handsome young woman, who makes her living as a *Botenfrau*, going errands with her *Schiebkarren*. She is quick of repartee, and always ready to play a prank on the stronger sex, which she affects to despise. On one occasion (p. 13) she pretends not to be able to extricate her heavily laden cart, which is stuck in the mud up to the hubs. The tailor, the weaver, and finally the husky smith try successively to pull out the cart, but in vain. Thereupon *Heiteretei*, with some effort, to be sure, pulls it out unaided, and thus has the laugh on the men. On p. 260 this incident is referred to:

"ja, und daß sie tut, als könnt' sie den verbrannten Karrn nicht herausbringen aus dem Dr—ck, und man springt bei aus christlicher Liebe, und es ist ihr nur darum, daß sie einen auslachen will."

There is no manuscript witness extant; the first book edition of 1857 (p. 413) has the same reading. No editor comments on the passage, in which *verbrannten* is evidently a misprint for *verdamnten*.

W. KURRELMEYER

<sup>8</sup> E. g., J. W. Cunliffe, 1913; T. M. Parrott, 1910-1914; Julia H. Harris, 1926; H. Harvey Wood, 1934-1938.

<sup>9</sup> J. P. Collier, 1829; W. C. Hazlitt, 1875; A. W. Verity, 1888.

<sup>10</sup> E. g., E. Koepfel, *Ben Jonson's Wirkung auf zeitgenössische Dramatiker* (Heidelberg, 1906); Mina Kerr, *Influence of Ben Jonson on English Comedy* (Philadelphia, 1912); and Brinkley, *op. cit.*

<sup>1</sup> *Die Heiteretei und ihr Widerspiel* herausgegeben von Paul Merker, 1912. München und Leipzig, verlegt bei Georg Müller.

## SUR UN PASSAGE DE PANTAGRUEL

M. Boulenger a spirituellement dit 'qu'il est aujourd'hui possible d'entendre Rabelais, ou à peu près.'<sup>1</sup> Il reste, en effet, des passages qui sont encore obscurs. Voici l'un d'eux: 'En ce point entra en la salle où l'on banquetoit, et hardiment, qu'il espoventa bien l'assistance; . . .'<sup>2</sup> Les *Chroniques admirables*<sup>3</sup> donnent une autre leçon: 'et croyez hardiment qu'il espoventa. . .'. N'est-ce pas là une variante plus satisfaisante?

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

## REVIEWS

*La Pensée européenne au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle de Montesquieu à Lessing.*

Par PAUL HAZARD. 3 Vols. Paris: Boivin, 1946. Pp. vi + 377 + 301 + 156.

Paul Hazard died in Paris on April 12, 1944. He had taken an active part in the defense of France up to the summer of 1940, had escaped to America, and had begun his courses at Columbia when Marshal Pétain recalled him to France. His American friends urged him not to go and reminded him that Hitler's promises, on which the actions of the Marshal were based, were worth exactly nothing. However, he felt that France needed him, that he must answer the call, whatever sacrifices and hardships it might entail. Accordingly he and his wife returned to France early in 1941. When he beheld Vichy, he realized what was going on. Pétain, he concluded, was either a traitor or in his dotage. He certainly did not understand Hazard, for he offered to make him rector of the University of Paris. Hazard declined. Pétain insisted, ordering

<sup>1</sup> Rabelais, *Œuvres complètes*, éd. de la Pléiade (Paris, 1934), p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 207 (*Pantagruel*, ch. iv). Cette leçon apparaît dès l'édition in-4<sup>o</sup> de *Pantagruel*, chez Claude Nourry, à Lyon, et se retrouve dans toutes les éditions de *Pantagruel* que nous avons consultées, en particulier dans l'édition de François Juste, à Lyon, en 1533 (cf. la réimpression par P. Babeau, Jacques Boulenger et H. Patry [Paris, 1904], p. 15).

<sup>3</sup> *The Tale of Gargantua and King Arthur* . . . ed. by Huntington Brown (Cambridge, 1932), p. 59; *La seconde Chronique de Gargantua et de Pantagruel*, éd. p. Paul Lacroix (Paris, 1872), p. 68. J'ai étudié les relations entre les chroniques gargantuines et *Pantagruel*, dans un article qui paraîtra dans *PMLA*.

him to obey. Hazard still objected and finally asked if the Germans had been consulted. This was a detail the aged puppet had overlooked. When Hazard's name was proposed, the Germans refused their approbation. Hazard then taught at the University of Lyons until, in the summer of 1942, he was allowed to return to the Collège de France. His death prevented his welcoming to Paris his American friends.<sup>1</sup>

In these three volumes he has left us his final message. They were completed in manuscript before his death, were seen through the press by his wife, and appeared in the third quarter of 1946. They combine the clarity, the wit, and the interest in ideas of the "philosophes" with the warmth and charm of "l'homme de sentiment," whose history Hazard also intended to write:

Il faudrait, pour achever l'histoire intellectuelle du dix-huitième siècle, considérer la naissance et la croissance de l'homme de sentiment, jusqu' à la Révolution française. Cette entreprise, nous l'avons commencée, déjà; nous la poursuivrons; nous l'achèverons peut-être quelque jour. . . . (I, v)

But this was not to be. What we have might be called 'The Rise and Fall of the *Philosophes*.' It concerns their efforts to free mankind from ancient prejudices, their close approach to victory, the opposition they encountered both without the movement and within, and their failure to solve the problems they had undertaken to study. They left a divided, but not a desperate Europe, which personifies

plus que tout autre continent, la condition humaine. Elle n'admet pas que ce qui est, doive être nécessairement: elle ne s'abandonne pas au nirvana. Elle ne met pas sa confiance dans un mécanisme qui, augmentant le bien-être, endort la pensée. Elle n'est pas lâche; elle ne se soumet pas, . . . ses découragements sont sans lendemain. (II, 261-2)

The book is a sequel to the *Crise de la conscience européenne*, which, as has been suggested, might better have been called the *Crise de la conscience de quelques européens*, since the *crise* had not been generalized. And, indeed, the earlier title might better have been given to the sequel, for it was in the eighteenth century that the struggle took on wide significance. Hazard describes the methods employed by the leaders, their use of irony, their pursuit of happiness, their attack on organized religion, their offer of deism, their interest in science, their efforts to reform government, morals, education, the writing of history, and law. They traveled from one European country to another, they discussed ideas, they wrote to one another at a time when "les lettres n'étaient pas la corvée, mais les délices de chaque jour" (I, 316). But their gods, Nature and Reason, were not in accord. The year that the Academy of Berlin awarded to Adolf Friedrich von Rheinard the prize for his discussion of the "système de Pope contenu dans la proposition:

<sup>1</sup> I have learned most of these facts from Mme Hazard.



*Tout est bien*," came the earthquake at Lisbon. And Lessing attacked Voltaire in much the same temper as that in which the Frenchman had sought to crush "l'infâme."

With the internationalism, under French leadership, of the *Philosophes* contrasted the enthusiasm roused in 1765 by de Belloy's *Siège de Calais*, praise of *italianità*, and Gleim's *Chants d'un grenadier prussien*, which prepared the way for the triumphs of nationalism in the nineteenth century and the woes that still follow them.

The only important omission I find in the work, as in its predecessor, is due to the almost complete neglect of the theater. Yet the stage must have contributed to the broadcasting of ideas. If Marmontel's mother, the wife of a village tailor, knew by heart large portions of *Zaïre*, surely the heroine's reflection that religion is largely a matter of geography — "J'eusse été près du Gange esclave des faux dieux," etc.—was not without its effect in bringing about liberation from ecclesiastical oppression.

But the author gives so much that in contrast this omission is quite pardonable. Based on his own investigations and on those of many scholars, presented as objectively as one could ask, written with the delightful clarity, taste, and humor that gave Hazard his seat in the French Academy, the work will be profitable to specialists and to those who are not, to all, indeed, who would know a society that is not ours, but upon whose discoveries, combats, and hopes much of our own depends.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

*Milton and the Renaissance Ovid.* By DAVIS P. HARDING. *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, xxx, iv. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. 105. \$1.50, paper; \$2.00, cloth.

Although this monograph is ostensibly a study of sources, it is one which seldom stoops to the mere assembling of parallels. Mr. Harding has added much that is significant to our understanding of Milton's indebtedness to Ovid, and yet one finds even more interest in what he has contributed to our knowledge of Milton's early reading, Milton's turning away from classical mythology, Milton's acquaintance with Renaissance redactions of Ovid, Milton's adherence to his own principle of decorum, and the complex problem of the poet's reliance on his readers to respond imaginatively to connotative allusions.

What is true of most problems in Miltonic studies is true of Mr. Harding's subject: it has been repeatedly considered by previous scholars. One of the most persistent concerns of Milton's editors since the time of Hume has been the annotation of Milton's allusions

to, and borrowings from, Ovid among the other classical writers. Mr. Harding acknowledges his own debt to such works as Osgood's *Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems*, Rand's *Milton in Rustication*, Hanford's *Youth of Milton*, and Bush's *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*. But Mr. Harding's study takes a direction which—save for Professor Bush—scholars have not previously followed. His purpose was to see Ovid as Milton saw him, to examine the Renaissance editions of Ovid which Milton himself might have used, and, after studying the annotations which reveal the prevailing Renaissance interpretation of Ovid, to reevaluate the use which Milton made of the Roman poet. This is a praiseworthy intention reflecting, as it does, a rather recent tendency towards a more sophisticated historical point of view among students who have found it necessary to base critical judgments of any sort on reconstructed cultural contexts. Having justified his own book on the ground that previous studies were concerned only with the classical, not with the Renaissance, Ovid, Mr. Harding assumes the burden of showing significant differences between the two Ovids and of proving that an acquaintance with the Ovid known to the Renaissance affects our reading of Milton. He succeeds in both.

Mr. Harding's opening chapter sketches adequately—though not definitively, for little direct reference is made to patristic or scholastic writers—the fabrication of the Christian Ovid in the Middle Ages. He shows how Ovid was adapted to Christian purposes by means of allegorical and tropological interpretation and how this medieval reading of Ovid was perpetuated by the fourteenth-century *Ovide Moralisé* and by such subsequent works as the *Metamorphosis Ovidiana Moraliter . . . Explanata* of Petrus Berchorius, the annotated edition of the *Metamorphoses* by Raphael Regius, the commentaries of Petrus Lavinius and Jacobus Micyllus, and the heavily “allegorized” translations of the *Metamorphoses* by Arthur Golding and George Sandys. This is a highly interesting chapter which demonstrates how vastly different *Ovidius Christianus* was from *Ovidius Romanus* and how widespread this moralized reading of Ovid was through the first quarter of the seventeenth century. All such interpretations, as Mr. Harding tells us, proceeded from the desire to reconcile Ovid's tales with orthodox Christian theology. Ovid's treatments of the Creation and the Flood were accepted as Roman versions of the accounts in Genesis, and many of the myths retold by Ovid were interpreted in allegorical or tropological terms. Thus, for example, Ovid's version of the Flood “differs only in giving Noah and his wife the poetical aliases of Deucalion and Pyrrha” (p. 15).

In laying a foundation for evaluating Milton's use of this Ovidian tradition, Mr. Harding fulfills three subordinate biographical purposes of his study: to consider the part which St. Paul's School

played in cultivating Milton's enthusiasm for Ovid; to trace chronologically the thread of Ovid's influence on Milton; and to explain each successive change in Milton's attitude towards Ovid. In fact, the brilliant argument by means of which Mr. Harding proves, quite convincingly, that Milton must have entered St. Paul's earlier than the accepted date 1620—Mr. Harding believes that April, 1617 is the most likely date—is one of the most impressive parts of his book. If his argument is as sound as it appears, Milton's acquaintance with Ovid must have begun as early as 1619. The Latin poems written at St. Paul's (1617-25) and at Cambridge (1625-29) are thoroughly Ovidian in tone and are characterized by four kinds of borrowings: epithets taken from Ovid and applied to the same person or thing, epithets taken from Ovid but applied to different persons or things, phrases taken from Ovid but used in quite different contexts, and phrases widely separated in Ovid but fused and taken over by Milton. It is Mr. Harding's contention that Milton's warm admiration of Ovid—and especially of his love poetry—persisted until he left Cambridge, but that by the spring of 1630 Milton had ended his apprenticeship to Ovid's erotic poetry. Although the influence of Ovid on these Latin poems has long been acknowledged, Mr. Harding argues that "occasional instances of the poet's indebtedness to Ovid have gone unnoticed, largely because the editors have not acquainted themselves with the established interpretation of the text of the *Metamorphoses* in Milton's own day" (p. 49); and he succeeds, with several specific instances of considerable interest, in showing how an acquaintance with the Renaissance interpretation of Ovid materially affects our reading of Milton's allusions to the Latin poet.

The last two chapters of Mr. Harding's book, on *Comus* and *Paradise Lost*, seem distinctly inferior to the first three. Here the reader is increasingly troubled by the author's failure to distinguish meticulously between allegorical and tropological interpretations, by his tendency, when the influence is slight and insignificant, to claim more than evidence warrants, and especially by his refusal, in at least one instance, to consider all possibilities.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Harding's chapter on *Paradise Lost* in particular would be greatly strengthened if he brought to his subject a wider knowledge of patristic, scholastic, and rabbinical commentaries on the Bible and of medieval Christian homiletics. Such an acquaintance would probably have supported his argument as a whole but would have demanded modification of his assertion that "among the multitudinous sources from which Milton derived suggestions for the treatment of his themes, only the Bible has a more important role than the literature

<sup>1</sup> In discussing Milton's description of *Comus'* magic rod (p. 64 f.), Mr. Harding argues that Milton was indebted to Ovid alone rather than to Spenser, as has usually been understood. The evidence, however, does not exclude the possibility of Milton's being indebted to both Ovid and Spenser.

of Greece and Rome" (p. 67). However, much as conservative readers will discount a few mere verbal parallels, Mr. Harding has shown that there are many features of *Paradise Lost* laden with Ovidian connotations for the seventeenth-century reader but lost upon the reader of today, largely because we have forgotten the Christianized Ovid.<sup>2</sup> And his comment on the allegory of Sin and Death in *Paradise Lost* does, indeed, make that episode far more suggestive to the modern reader.

Mr. Harding concludes that Ovid's influence on Milton ended with *Paradise Lost*; he has found no more than "a shadowy trace of indebtedness to Ovid" in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, and he believes that this negative evidence "strongly implies that there came a time when . . . [Milton] could no longer see any common ground of truth between classical mythology and Christian teaching." Once Milton had convinced himself that pagan myths were merely fiction, he was unable to condone their use in Christian poetry and "turned his back on the bright, enchanting world of pagan mythology" (p. 98 f.). This is a most reasonable thesis, both because it follows from the sort of evidence which Mr. Harding has presented and because it agrees with other critics' conclusions, arrived at from different directions. It must be noted however, that such a view tends to put greater emphasis on Milton's Hebraism than some critics would allow, since Mr. Harding's whole purpose really results in demonstrating that the world of pagan mythology was not bright or enchanting to Milton merely because it was classical, but rather because it was both classical and capable of Christian interpretation.

F. MICHAEL KROUSE

*The University of Cincinnati*

---

*From Classic to Romantic, Premises of Taste in Eighteenth-Century England.* By WALTER JACKSON BATE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946. Pp. x + 197. \$3.00.

This volume contains the Lowell Lectures given in the spring of 1945; and is dedicated to the Lowell Lecturer of the spring of 1925, Professor A. N. Whitehead, to whom the younger lecturer acknowledges "a great debt." In six lectures, or chapters, Mr. Bate first outlines the classic and neo-classic conceptions of art and aesthetic judgment, founded on confidence in reason and the rationality of the universe; then traces the scrutiny of reason's claims by

\* The association of Satan with both Phaeton and Typhon, for example, was common in Renaissance interpretations of Ovid and seems to have been intended by Milton in several passages (*P. L.*, I, 196-200, 230-38; III, 591-98, 374-82).

psychological empiricism which ended by dissolving them, and which simultaneously encouraged the growth of individualism and of subjective theories of taste; and finally presents the outcome in what he terms "the English romantic compromise."

The story, of course, is an old one; though it can perhaps be endlessly retold with significant variations. Parts of it have, in fact, been retold in recent years with new detail or with fresh interpretation by a number of scholars. Mr Bate appears to owe nothing to any of these except Professor Lovejoy. Though he centres his version of the story in the literary critics and theorists, he is especially concerned to connect them with the currents and shifts of philosophical thought which, as he says, they reflect. In this he shows penetration and skill; and the connexions he establishes do much to lessen the dreariness of another encounter with du Bos, Rapin, Dacier, Bysshe, Gildon, Alison, Gerard, and others—all familiarly known to the seasoned reader of articles and monographs on literary theory of the eighteenth century. Indeed, Mr Bate's treatment of his subject suggests that the natural affinity of his volume is, not with the works just alluded to, but rather with such works as Professor Whitehead's *Science and the Modern World*, Mr Michael Roberts's *The Modern Mind*, and Professor Basil Willey's books.

Yet this juxtaposition is not fortunate, and could, if closely followed up, be unfair to Mr Bate. For his real theme is not that momentous and central subject, the eighteenth-century breakdown of faith in rationalism and shift to subjective, anti-rational individualism;—not this, but something more limited, and derivative. His real theme is the reflection of this "fundamental and pervasive" shift to be discerned in "premises of taste," in literary and artistic theory. The unhappy consequence is that, with two exceptions presently to be mentioned, pale and shadowy figures crowd Mr Bate's foreground, and obscure his intelligent grasp of the "fundamental and pervasive" alteration which controls their movements. The effect is that of putting the cart before the horse. The fact, nevertheless, that comparison with the work of Professor Whitehead and the others named above does suggest itself is striking testimony to Mr Bate's success in discovering significance in his subject, and to his success also in an arduous task of integration. Mr Bate is, in truth, thoughtful, judicious, and acute. He has discriminately brought into view the real bearings and quality of the classic and neo-classic "conceptions of the nature and purpose of art"; and from this solid foundation he rises, in his third chapter, to a discussion of Johnson which, taking it as a whole, can only be called a triumph of critical discernment, finely conceived and incisively presented. Johnson is one of the two exceptions alluded to above; and the other is Reynolds who, in the same chapter, is also soundly, though less notably, discussed.

But when this much is said, as a deserved tribute to Mr Bate's



ability, knowledge, and insight, it must regretfully be added that his book in its general effect is blurred. Barbarous agglomerations of abstract words, and weak generalizations, make the form of his statements more difficult than the substance requires; and one cannot help wondering what an audience, even though a Boston audience, was able to make of these chapters when heard as lectures. But more than opaque utterance robs this book of clear-cut effectiveness. Mr Bate studiously tries to be unemphatic; and in his final chapter he subsides into a blurred conclusion. All that he there says about continuity with the past persisting in the romantic movement in England is correct enough, and could, with a different emphasis, be valuable; but he perversely brings his evidence forward in an attempt to *characterize* the movement as a compromise. "This will never do!" As men animated by the spirit of compromise, the English romantic writers are impenetrably mysterious.

But one would not wish to end on this note; for even in his final chapter Mr Bate is everywhere thoughtful and is not infrequently illuminating. And though he has not wholly succeeded in carrying out an ambitious and exacting design, has failed to read his proof sheets with the care they deserved, and is less than satisfactory on the question of the relation between his work and that of others, still, his book is useful, helpful, and welcome.

ROBERT SHAFER

*University of Cincinnati*

---

*René Boylesve: l'homme, le peintre de la Touraine.* By ANDRÉ BOURGEOIS. Paris: Droz, 1945. Pp. 269.

In the "Avant-Propos" to this University of Paris doctoral dissertation on René Boylesve, the author states (pp. 7-8): "Nous nous contenterons . . . d'expliquer la partie de son œuvre qui se rattache à la province où il est né, où il a fait ses études et où il est revenu quelquefois pendant sa maturité." Prof. Bourgeois then actually proceeds to give us two studies almost exactly equal in length: one on the life and character of Boylesve, the other on his Tourangeau novels. The biographical sketch is the most detailed yet to have been written, though Prof. B. regrets that the full story can not be told until M. Gérard-Gailly, to whom Mme Boylesve entrusted all her husband's "papiers, manuscrits inédits, notes, carnets et correspondance" (*loc. cit.*) after his death, decides to publish them himself or to release them for publication. Despite this handicap, Prof. B. has written an exceedingly interesting biography that illuminates points in the novels about which one could previously only conjecture. The biography is followed by what is, in the main, a subtle and discerning analysis of Boylesve



the bourgeois, the artist, the lover, and the writer, though the chapter on "l'Amoureux" seems unnecessary or too long in view of the relative insignificance of the theme of love in the greatest of the Tourangeau novels.

It is these novels which are the subject of the second part of Prof. B.'s study, "le Peintre de la Touraine." No one will quarrel with the statement (p. 129) that Boylesve's "études de mœurs provinciales forment probablement la partie la plus solide de son œuvre et celle qui restera la plus vivante," though one may well quarrel with Prof. B.'s excessive praise, in the early chapters of his book, of such *œuvres de jeunesse* as *Sainte-Marie des fleurs* and *le Parfum des îles Borromées*. In his painstaking critique of the Tourangeau novels, Prof. B. proves conclusively that Boylesve was both a skillful "peintre" and an acute "psychologue" who "n'est pas plus réactionnaire qu'il n'est révolutionnaire" (p. 260), and that his "romans provinciaux" constitute a forceful depiction of "le premier stade de la désintégration de la bourgeoisie de sa province" (p. 251). Prof. B. rightfully emphasizes Boylesve's objectivity and the fact that "jamais (il) ne prêche" (p. 225); unfortunately, he is himself unable to maintain the same high level of objectivity. He constantly interjects his own opinions, which usually reflect a nostalgia for the good old days in the French provinces and a personal philosophy of conservatism which would seem, at the very least, to be out of place in a doctoral dissertation. Take, for example, this comment on Mme Coeffeteau, of *la Jeune fille bien élevée*, described as

un personnage intéressant qui incarne bien l'âme de sa classe dans une dangereuse période de transition: . . . nous autres qui recueillons actuellement les fruits de tous ces changements, nous sommes tout prêts à sympathiser avec la pauvre femme et à regretter que la vie de nos vieilles provinces ne soit pas restée ce qu'elle était pendant les siècles de cristallisation; et la vie que mènent les nations plus radicalement avancées que la nôtre ne peut guère nous inspirer que le regret du conservatisme de nos aïeux (pp. 203-204).

Prof. B.'s study is not free of factual errors; we are told, for instance, in a foot-note to p. 163, that *l'Enfant à la balustrade* was written ten years after *Mademoiselle Cloque*; actually they were only four years apart. And the scholarly apparatus leaves much to be desired. The list of the "Œuvres de Boylesve" is far from complete; such works as *les Bains de Bade* (1896), *la Marchande des petits pains pour les canards* (1931), *Ah! Plaisez-moi* (1922) and others are not even mentioned. The title of *Souvenirs du jardin détruit* is given as *Souvenirs d'un jardin détruit*. Many of the 27 volumes that are listed are given, strangely enough, not the dates of original publication but those, presumably, of the editions used for the study. Thus, Boylesve's very first novel, *le Médecin des dames de Néans* (1896), is dated 1926; *Mademoiselle Cloque* (1899) is dated 1921; *la Becquée* (1901) is dated 1905, and so on.

The bibliography of secondary sources is very incomplete; not a single American article on Boylesve is listed and many French items are lacking, notably the Sat., Jan. 23, 1926 issue of *les Nouvelles littéraires*, largely devoted to an "Hommage à René Boylesve" in which such writers as Henri de Régnier, Paul Valéry, Jacques des Gachons, Jean-Louis Vaudoyer, Gérard-Gailly and others paid tribute to their recently deceased friend and confrere. Finally, there is an "Index des noms de personnes" which is merely a list of names, without page-references, and so of little use. Prof. B. has written a highly readable book, which will be welcomed by all lovers of the delicate art of Boylesve; but the definitive scholarly work on the subject still awaits an author.

AARON SCHAFFER

*The University of Texas*

---

*The Use of Color in Literature. A Survey of Research.* By SIGMUND SKARD. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1946. Pp. 87. (*Proceedings*, vol. 90, no. 3.)

Students of literature cannot afford to overlook the publications of the American Philosophical Society, even if most of them are concerned with alien fields. In recent years the journals of the Bartrams and Cailliet's *Idéologues* attest this fact, and the society is soon to publish a monograph on the French dramatist, Alexandre Hardy, that will correct many statements that have been made about his life and reproduce a large number of hitherto inaccessible documents. Further evidence is supplied by the fact that last year the society brought out Mr. Skard's important contribution to the history of the use of color in literature.

His work is primarily a bibliography that lists the titles of nearly 1200 works in many languages. No one who studies a writer's use of color can safely ignore it. The list of titles is preceded by a survey of the field to the end on 1938, excellent despite the loss in Japan of the cards on which the work was based. In the first of the two chapters into which the survey is divided Mr. Skard discusses briefly remarks made by the ancients, medieval churchmen, Renaissance painters, and Goethe about the use of color in literature, but he finds that the careful investigation of the subject began in 1858 with Gladstone's *Studies on Homer*. Among later writers special attention is given to Groos and Weisgerber, special praise to Demorest's treatment of Flaubert. In his second chapter Mr. Skard discusses the use of color in various epochs. The authors whose works have most stimulated investigation are Dante, Goethe, and Hugo, but the list includes many others, from Homer to Hofmannsthal and Conrad. Gaps in our knowledge are clearly indicated, so that the survey may well suggest many subjects for dissertations.

There is no real difficulty in understanding Mr. Skard, but it is unfortunate that he was obliged to translate his manuscript himself from Norwegian into English. An over-generous use of the definite article is often apparent, and there are a number of peculiar expressions.<sup>1</sup> Only once, however, is the reader misled. This happens when Skard writes, "Huizinga's description of the fall colors of the Middle Ages" (p. 177) instead of "Huizinga's description of color in the later Middle Ages."<sup>2</sup>

In concluding the author finds that the results of color research are fragmentary and that we are far from having satisfactory surveys even of the greatest stylistic periods, but he contends that the field is fertile and that the problems that present themselves are fundamental to all literary research. His book will do much to make such future investigation more than merely something to be desired.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

*Beowulf in Modern Verse with an Essay and Pictures.* By GAVIN BONE. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1945. Pp. x + 84. 15/-.

All students of Old English (and a good many others) will want this book for the pictures in it—fresh and bold illustrations of events in *Beowulf*. Here are bright-colored impressions of the struggle between the Geat and Grendel, the fight between Beowulf and Grendel's dam, the terrifying country about the mere, the unhappy men as they sit on the shore awaiting their leader's return from the bottom of the sea—seven in all. Here too are brief comments on such critical matters as the poet's skill in narration and description, and his intention in writing the poem.

There are several pages on translating *Beowulf*. Bone's aim is to reproduce the poem's "noble brevity in many passages; its magisterial movement; and its picturesque and peculiar equivalents for ordinary things." Rejecting the long couplet of Strong and Leonard, the original meter of the poem used by Scott-Moncrieff (who "will not budge a quarter of an inch to be intelligible"), and blank verse (because of its strong poetical traditions that are completely irrelevant in a translation of *Beowulf*), Bone uses lines of varying length riming in quatrains. The result is not good on first

<sup>1</sup> For instance: "Against this background the author follows how the terms held their ground" (p. 187); "all forms of material civilization compends and compilations" (p. 188); "elementary investigations are still undone" (p. 203); "the three horses of the Apocalypse" (p. 188, three of the four?); "St. George" (p. 231; he means the German poet, not the dragon's conqueror).

<sup>2</sup> The slip is the more surprising as Skard cites, not only the Dutch title, which means "The Autumn of the Middle Ages," but the English translation, entitled "The Waning of the Middle Ages."

impression, but I have discovered that reading the translation aloud improves it no end: one gets a sense of the verse-paragraphs—the stops are chiefly internal—and the rime only now and then impedes the flow of a passage.

The diction is intentionally “fresh and bold.” The use of such a word as *scuggy*, which “so obviously means what it says,” is not at all out of place; and many of the kennings are vividly translated, as *dawn-sound of dismay* for *morgenswäg*. A good deal of liberty is taken with the original: nearly 500 lines are left out; other lines are condensed; the parts of the minstrel’s song about Hildeburg and Hengest are rearranged. But this is an impressionistic translation; and though one must agree with the writer of the preface that the ideal translation of this poem is “on before,” it is good to have this record of the impression made by *Beowulf* on a young artist and poet whose untimely death in 1942 not only prevented his revising this work and completing the series of illustrations but also deprived us of further contributions to Old English studies.

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

Louisiana State University

### BRIEF MENTION

*French Studies. A Quarterly Review.* As the editorial board of *MLR* contains specialists in English, German, and Spanish only, the need for a British learned magazine devoted to French has been for some time obvious. The answer is the launching of this new review under the general editorship of Mr. Ewart, who associates with himself MM. Clapton, Dechamps, Green, Orr, Rudler, and Vinaver. The first number (Jan., 1947), which runs to 94 pages, contains two long articles—one on fifty years of research devoted to Mallarmé, the other concerned with recent works on seventeenth-century literature—and two short ones: the reproduction by Mr. Vinaver of Flaubert’s hitherto unpublished *Influence des Arabes d’Espagne sur la civilisation française du moyen âge*, and a note in which Claudel is quoted as correcting a statement made by Yeats in regard to *l’Annonce faite à Marie*. These are followed by seventeen reviews, three pages of “Varia,” and five of “Books Received.” The magazine is published at Oxford by Mr. Basil Blackwell. The annual subscription is 25 shillings. Early in its sixty-second year, *MLN* is delighted to see this evidence of the pioneering spirit on the part of its transatlantic neighbors and extends to *FS* its most cordial greetings and best wishes.

H. C. L.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

Brown, L. S., Waite, H. O., and Atkinson, B. P., (eds.).—Literature for our time: an anthology for college freshmen. *New York*: Holt, 1947. Pp. xii + 951. \$3.85.

Dunn, E. Catherine.—The concept of ingratitude in Renaissance English moral philosophy. *Washington*: Catholic Univ. Press, 1946. Pp. xvi + 133.

Harbage, Alfred.—As they liked it: an essay on Shakespeare and morality. *New York*: Macmillan, 1947. Pp. xiii + 238. \$2.75.

Hoefling, Sister Mary C.—A study of the structure of meaning in the sentences of the satiric verse *Characters* of John Dryden. *Washington*: Catholic Univ. Press, 1946. Pp. ix + 133.

Kennedy, Wilma L.—The English heritage of Coleridge of Bristol, 1798. The basis in eighteenth-century English thought for his distinction between imagination and fancy. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. vii + 100. One plate. \$2.50. (Yale Studies in English, Vol. 104).

Reade, Aleya L.—Johnsonian gleanings. Part X, Johnson's early life: the final narrative. *London*: Humphries, 1946. Pp. xii + 224. 21s.

Shackford, Martha H.—Studies of certain nineteenth century poets. *Natick, Mass.*: Suburban Press, 1946. Pp. 95.

Ure, Peter.—Towards a mythology: studies in the poetry of W. B. Yeats. *Liverpool*: Univ. Press, 1946. Pp. 123. 8s. 6d.

## GERMAN

Barker, M. L., and Homeyer, H.—The Pocket Oxford German Dictionary. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1946. xvi, 432 pp. \$1.50.

Bernard, Victor.—Henri Heine. *Paris*: Grasset, 1946. 415 pp. Fr. 250.

Hemmen, Alcuin A., O.S.B.—The Concept of Religious Tolerance in the Novels of Enrica von Handel-Mazzetti. [Ph. D. Diss.]. *Ann Arbor*: Univ. of Michigan, 1945. 2 ll., 134 pp.

Kayser, Wolfgang.—Kleine deutsche Versschule. [Sammlung Dalp Bd. 21]. *Bern*: A. Francke AG. [1946]. 118 pp.

Mustard, Helen Meredith.—The Lyric Cycle in German Literature. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1946. 275 pp., \$3.00.

Reiff, Paul.—Die Ästhetik der deutschen Frühromantik. Hrsg. von Theodor Geissen-doerfer. [Illinois Studies in Language and Literature Vol. XXXI. Nos. 1-2.] *Urbana*,

Ill.: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1946. 305 pp., \$3.00.

Rodeck, Herbert Alfred Frederick.—Das Adjektiv in den Gesammelten Gedichten Gottfried Kellers. J. H. U. Diss. 1941. *Chicago*, Ill.: 1946. xiv, 36, 77 typewritten pp. 4°.

## FRENCH

Aegerter, E., et P. Labranche.—Au temps de Guillaume Apollinaire. *Paris*: Julliard, 1946. 245 pp.

Balzac.—Le Curé de Tours, éd. Albert Arrault. *Tours*: Arrault, 1946. 123 pp. Fr. 175.

— La Grenadière, éd. Albert Arrault. *Ibid.*, 1946. 73 pp. Fr. 125.

Bentley, C. A.—Express It in French. *London*: New Europe pub., 1946. 112 pp. 2/6.

Boulenger, J.—Les Romans de la Table Ronde. *Paris*: Plon, 1945. vi + 468 pp. Fr. 200.

Briquet, P.-E.—Pierre Loti et l'Orient. *Neuchâtel*: Eds. de la Baconnière, 1945. 615 pp.

Brunschvicg, L.—Descartes et Pascal, lecteurs de Montaigne. *Neuchâtel*: La Baconnière, 1945. 210 pp.

Buchet, E.—Ecrivains intelligents du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Paris*: Corrêa, 1945. 168 pp.

Castelnau, J.—Marguerite de Navarre. La reine Margot. *Paris*: Hachette, 1945. 255 pp. Fr. 65.

Coursier, E. and C. McDonald.—Manual of Conversation. Fr.-Eng. *New York*: Ungar, 1946. 256 pp. \$2.00.

Davenson, H.—Le Livre des chansons ou Introd. à la connaissance de la chanson populaire française. *Neuchâtel*: La Baconnière, 1944. 589 pp.

Delattre, Floris.—La Personnalité d'Auguste Angellier. T. II. *Paris*: Vrin, 1944. 348 pp. Fr. 100.

Dubois-Dumée, J.-P.—Solitude de Péguy. *Paris*: Plon, 1946. iv + 180 pp. Fr. 65.

Fagus.—Vers et prose, éd. Henri Martineau. *Blainville-sur-mer*. L'Amitié par le livre, 1946. 79 pp. Fr. 80.

Farges, Marcel.—Poètes des temps présents. *Paris*: Messein, 1946. 46 pp.

Faure, Gabriel.—Mallarmé à Tournon. Lettres à Aubanel, Mistral et Cazalis. *Paris*: Horizons de la France, 1946. 139 pp. Fr. 150.

Fellows, Otis.—The Periodical Press in Liberated Paris: a survey and a checklist. *Syracuse*: S. Univ. Press, 1946. v + 29 pp.

Fontenelle.—Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes habités, éd. T. Maulnier. *Paris*: Nouvelle France, 1945. xv + 146 pp.



**Fowlie, Wallace.**—Rimbaud. *New York: New Directions*, 1946. 160 pp.

**Gautier, T.**—Emaux et camées, éd. J. Pommier. *Paris: Droz*, 1945. xv + 146 pp.

**Giese, W. F. (tr.).**—French Lyrics in English Verse. *Madison: U. of Wisconsin Press*, 1946. xxviii + 394 pp. \$4.00.

**Glutz, M. et M. Maire.**—Salons du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Paris: Hachette*, 1945. 287 pp. Fr. 65.

**Ham, E. B.**—Textual Criticism and Jehan le Venelais. *Ann Arbor: U. of Mich. Press*, 1946. 109 pp. \$1.00.

**Henriot, E. (éd.).**—Lettres du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Paris: Plon*, 1945. vi + 58 pp.

**Hytier, Jean.**—André Gide. *Paris: Charlot*, 1946. 319 pp.

—Les Arts de littérature. *Ibid.*, 1946. 167 pp. Fr. 150.

**Jacob, Louis.**—Fabre d'Eglantine, chef des Fripons. *Paris: Hachette*, 1946. 318 pp. Fr. 140.

**Janet, Gaston (éd.).**—Poètes du terroir. *Paris: Revue moderne*, 1946. 140 pp. Fr. 85.

**Lalou, R. (éd.).**—Les Plus Beaux Poèmes français. *Paris: Presses universitaires*, 1946. 287 pp. Fr. 150.

**Lamartine.**—Antoniella, éd. H. Guillemin. *Porrentruy: Aux Portes de France*, 1945. 221 pp.

—Lettres inédites (1821-51), éd. H. Guillemin. *Ibid.*, 1944. 117 pp.

**Léautaud, P.**—Le Théâtre de Maurice Boissard, 1907-23. *Paris: Gallimard*, 1945. 392 pp. Fr. 135.

**Martineau, H.**—L'Œuvre de Stendhal. *Prais: Le Divan*, 1945. 546 pp.

**Nerval, Gérard de.**—Sylvie, suivie de Léo Burckart et d'Aurélié, éd. H. Clouard. *Monaco: Eds. du Rocher*, 1946. xx + 247 pp. Fr. 130.

**Palante, Alain.**—Mauriac, le roman et la vie. *Paris: le Portulan*, 1946. 198 pp. Fr. 120.

**Pascal.**—Discours sur les passions de l'amour, ed. A. Wild. *Porrentruy: Aux Portes de France*, 1945. 58 pp.

**Pommier, J.**—Dans les chemins de Baudelaire. *Paris: Corti*, 1945. 384 pp.

**Pradier, Mireille.**—La Vie de Jean de La Fontaine. *Paris: Willeb*, 1946. 96 pp. Fr. 30.

**Racine.**—Phèdre. Mise en scène et commentaires de J.-L. Barrault. *Paris: Eds. du Seuil*, 1946. 231 pp. Fr. 80.

**Rimbaud.**—Prose Poems from the "Illuminations," tr. Louise Varèse. *New York: New Directions*, 1946. xxxi + 141 pp.

**Sand, G.**—Histoire de ma vie (extraits), éd. J. et J. Tharaud. *Paris: Stock*, 1945. 345 pp.

**Sartre, J.-P.**—L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme. *Paris: Nagel*, 1946. 141 pp. Fr. 87.

**Soupault, Philippe.**—Lautréamont. *Paris: Seghers*, 1946. 205 pp. Fr. 100.

**Suffel, Jacques.**—Anatole France. *Paris: Eds. du Myrte*, 1946. 413 pp. Fr. 165.

**Suire, Louis.**—Le Paysage charentais dans l'œuvre d'Eugène Fromentin et de Pierre Loti. *La Rochelle: Eds. à la Rose des vents*, 1946. 123 pp.

**Théophile de Viau.**—La Maison de Sylvie, éd. G. Caspari. *Porrentruy: Aux Portes de France*, 1945. 169 pp.

**Valéry, P.**—Voltaire. *Paris: Domat-Monchrestien*, 1945. 37 pp.

**Vaunois, L. et J. Bour (eds.).**—Les Poètes de la vie. Œuvres inédites d'auteurs contemporains. *Paris: Corrèa*, 1945. 224 pp.

**Vianey, Joseph.**—Les "Odes" de Ronsard. *Paris: SFELT*, 1946. 191 pp. Fr. 90.

—"Les Regrets" de Joachim du Bellay. *Ibid.*, 1946. 191 pp. Fr. 90.

**Voltaire.**—Zadig, éd. V. L. Saulnier. *Paris: Droz*, 1946. xxxvii + 105 pp. Fr. 75.

**Yvert-Méléra, M.**—Résonnances autour de Rimbaud. *Paris: Eds. du Myrte*, 1946. 206 pp. Fr. 132.

## SPANISH

**Abreu Gómez, E.**—Lecciones de lit. esp. *Mexico: Revista Musical Mexicana*, 1944. 127 pp.

**Arjona, J. H.**—Viaje de negocios. *New York: American Bk. Co.*, 1945. vii + 229 pp. \$1.80.

**Arrazola, R.**—Diccionario de modismos argentinos. *Buenos Aires: Ed. Colombia*, 1943. 192 pp.

**Beña, Cristóbal de.**—Fabulas Políticas, ed. Luis Montañés. *Madrid: Suárez*, 1946. xiv + 52 pp.

**Boscán, Juan.**—Coplas, Sonetos y otras poesías, ed. Manuel de Montoliu. *Barcelona: Montaner y Simón*, 1946. xxxix + 245 pp.

**Carbonell, Diego.**—Lo morboso en Rubén Darío, ed. J. A. Cova. *Caracas: Cecilio Acosta*, 1943.

**Carreras, Cesar.**—"La Cartera Roja." Cuentos, poesías y otros trabajos, ed. Raimundo de los Reyes. 236 pp.

**Casaldueño, Joaquín.**—Jorge Guillén, Cántico. *Santiago de Chile: Cruz del Sur* [N. Y.: Macmillan], 1946. 336 pp.

**Casals, J.**—Plácido como poeta cubano. Ensayo biográfico. *Havana: Ministerio de Educación*, 1944. 199 pp.



**Fernández de Lizardi, J. J.**—Don Catrín de la Fachenda y fragmentos de otras obras, ed. J. R. Spell. *Mexico: Inst. de Lit. Iberoamericana*, 1944. xxi + 287 pp.

**Fusco Sansone, N.**—Vida y obras de Bartolomé Hidalgo, primer poeta uruguayo. *Montevideo*, 1944. 76 pp.

**Goggio, Emilio, and N. H. Tayler.**—Lecturas iberoamericanas. *Boston: Heath*, 1946. xi + 300 pp. \$1.60.

**Gutiérrez, J. M.**—Polémica en torno al idioma y a la Real Academia Esp., ed. E. Morales. *Buenos Aires: Ed. Americana*, 1942. 286 pp.

**Juan de la Cruz, San.**—Poesías completas y una selección de sus Comentarios en prosa por Eulalia Galvarriato de Alonso, ed. Dámaso Alonso. *Madrid: Aguilar*, 1946. 584 pp.

**Laferriere, Gregorio de.**—Obras escogidas, ed. J. M. Monner Sans. *Buenos Aires: Estrada*, 1943. 330 pp.

**Ledu, Renato.**—Los banquetes, ed. O. N. Bustamente. *Mexico: Ed. Stylo*, 1944. 171 pp.

**Malaret, A.**—Por mi patria y por mi idioma. *San Juan, P. R.: Tip. San Juan*, 1942. 33 pp.

**Martínez Centeno, R.**—Barbarismos y solecismos. *Caracas: Ed. Elite*, 1944.

**Maya, R.**—Consideraciones críticas sobre la lit. colombiana. *Bogotá: Libr. Voluntad*, 1944. 146 pp.

**Méndez Plancarte (ed.).**—Poetas novohispanos. Primer siglo (1521-1621). *Mexico: Univ. Nac. Autónoma*, 1942. lii + 168 pp.

**Miró, Rodrigo.**—De la vida intelectual en la colonia panameña. *Panama: Ayuntamiento de Panamá*, 1944. 45 pp.

—Bibliografía poética panameña, *Ibid.*: Imp. Nac., 1942. 61 pp.

**Monterde, Fr.**—Proteo. Fábula. Ed. E. Díez-Canedo. *Mexico: Ed. Intercontinental*, 1944. 71 pp.

**Muñoz, Matilde.**—Antología de Poetisas Hispanoamericanas. *Madrid: Aguilar*, 1946. 521 pp.

**Neruda, Pablo.**—Selección, ed. A. Aldunate. *Santiago de Chile: Ed. Nascimento*, 1943. 352 pp.

**Noeli, Teodosio.**—Sp.-Eng. Manual of Conversation. *New York: Ungar*, 1946. \$2.50.

**Norris y Velázquez, G.**—Pan American Reader. *New York: Pamphlet Distributing*, 1946. vii + 95 pp. \$2.00.

**Palma, Ricardo.**—Flor de tradiciones, ed. G. W. Umphrey y C. García Prada. *Mexico: Inst. de Lit. Iberoamericana*, 1943. xxvii + 272 pp.

**Pardo García, Germán.**—Antología poética, ed. A. Holguín y J. Araugo Ferrer. *Mexico: Imp. Veracruz*, 1944. xlv + 167 pp.

**Pinto, J.**—Lit. argentina del siglo XX. *Buenos Aires: Soc. Impresora Americana*, 1943. 188 pp.

**Quinamor, T. E.**—El triunfo de don Ricardo, ed. J. C. Watson. *New York: Holt*, 1946. \$1.32.

**Remos y Rubio, J. J.**—Hist. de la lit. cubana, ed. J. M. Chacón y Calvo. 3 v. *Havana: Cárdenas*, 1945.

**Rojas Carrasco, G.**—Chilenismos y americanismos. *Valparaíso: Dirección General de Prisiones*, 1943. 229 pp.

**Sánchez Juan, Sebastián.**—Blanco y Rosicler, Poemas, ed. Manuel de Montoliu. *Barcelona: Casa del Libro*, 1946. 92 pp.

**Spell, J. R.**—Contemporary Spanish-American Fiction. *Chapel Hill: U. of N. C. Press*, 1944. ix + 323 pp. \$3.00.

**Suárez, M. F.**—Sueños de Luciano Pulgar. T. VII. Ed. J. J. Ortega Torres. *Bogotá: Libr. Voluntad*, 1942. 346 pp.

**Trueta, J.**—The Spirit of Catalonia. *New York: Oxford U. Press*, 1946. iv + 198 pp. \$2.50.

**Ugarte, S.**—Notas de bibliografía mexicana. *Mexico: Aldina*, 1943. 107 pp.

**Uslari Petri, Arturo.**—Las lanzas coloradas, ed. D. D. Walsh. *New York: Norton*, 1944. 219 pp. \$1.65.

**Villa Valencia, Adolfo.**—Panem de Coelo, Auto Sacramental Eucarístico precedido de una Loa, ed. Fr. Arenas Martín. *Cádiz: "La Gaditana,"* 1946. 62 pp.

**Yáñez, A.**—El contenido social de la lit. iberoamericana. *Mexico: El Colegio de México*, 1944. 47 pp.

## PORTUGUESE

**Albuquerque, A. T.**—A opulência vocabular de Claudio de Souza. *Rio de Janeiro: Jornal do Comercio*, 1943. 32 pp.

**Almeida, J. V. F.**—Os gatos, ed. J. Lins do Rego. *Rio de Janeiro: Livros de Portugal* (1942). 332 pp.

**Alvarenga, M. I.**—*Glaura*. Poemas eróticos. Ed. A. Arinos de Melo Franco. *Rio de Janeiro: Imp. Nacional*, 1943. xxvii + 255 pp.

**Alves, Antonio de Castro.**—Obras completas, ed. A. Grieco. *Rio de Janeiro: Valverde*, 1943. vii + 203 pp.

**Assis, Machado de.**—Casa velha, ed. L. M. Pereira. *São Paulo: Martins*, 1944. 162 pp.

**Bandeira, M. & E. Cavalcheiro.**—Obras-primas da lírica brasileira. *São Paulo: Martins*, 1944. 391 pp.

**Bastide, Roger.**—A poesia afro-brasileira. *São Paulo*: Martins, 1943. 151 pp.

**Camara, J. M.**—Princípios de linguística geral como fundamento para os estudos superiores de língua portuguesa. *Rio de Janeiro*: Briguier, 1942. 268 pp.

**Cardoso, A. L.**—Memento filológico. Subsidios ao idioma. *Rio de Janeiro*: Guaiara, 1943. 147 pp.

**Castro, M. A. G. de.**—Família luso-brasileira: ensaios de literatura e estética. *Rio de Janeiro*: Olympio, 1943. 286 pp.

**Cintra, Geraldo de Ulhoa.**—Língua portuguesa. *São Paulo*: Anchieta, 1943. 116 pp.

**Codax, M., J. Zorro & P. Gomes Charinho.**—Tres poetas medievales portugueses. *Buenos Aires*: Ed. "El Uriponte," 1942. 42 pp.

**Dias, A. G.**—Poesias completas. I. Ed. J. Montello. *Rio de Janeiro*: Valverde, 1944. 286 pp.

**Figueiredo, F. de.**—A luta pela expressão. *Coinbra*: Nobel, 1944. 212 pp.

**Gonçalves Crespo.**—Obras completas, ed. A. Peixoto. *Rio de Janeiro*: Livros de Portugal, 1942. 332 pp.

**Gonzaga, T. A.**—Obras completas, ed. crítica de Rodrigues Lapa. *São Paulo*: Ed. Nacional, 1942. xliii + 556 pp.

**Hamilton, D. L., and Others.**—Conversas sul-americanas. *New York*: Crofts, 1946. vi + 218 pp. \$1.85.

**Jordan, E. L.**—Panorama do Brasil, ed. A. S. Pessôa. *New York*: Crofts, 1946. viii + 200 pp. \$1.85.

**Lima, H. & G. Barroso.**—Pequeno dicionário brasileiro da língua portuguesa, revisto por M. Bandeira e J. Baptista da Luz. *Rio de Janeiro*: Civilização Brasileira, 1942.

**Lima, Heitor Ferreira.**—Castro Alves e sua época. *São Paulo*: Anchieta, 1942. 207 pp.

**Lins do Rego, José.**—Fogo morto, ed. O. M. Carpeaux. *Rio de Janeiro*: Olympio, 1943, 1944. 370 pp.

**Lobo, C. N.**—Glorias brasileiras. 1a. serie. *São Paulo*: S. C. P., 1943. 201 pp.

**Lopes, A. R.**—Bom dia! One-minute dialogues in Port. *New York*: Crofts, 1946. 33 pp. \$.50.

**Meireles, Cecilia (ed.).**—Poetas novos de Portugal. *Rio de Janeiro*: Dois Mundos, 1944. 315 pp.

**Menezes, Raimundo de.**—A vida boêmia de Paula Ney, ed. J. F. Marques. *São Paulo*: Martins, 1944. 300 pp.

**Monteiro Lobato, J. B.**—Urupês, outros contos e contos, ed. A. Neves. *São Paulo*: Ed. Nacional, 1943. 713 pp.

**Montello, José.**—Gonçalves Dias. Ensaio bio-bibliográfico. *Rio de Janeiro*: Acad. Brasileira, 1942. 177 pp.

**Moog, C. V.**—Uma interpretação de literatura brasileira. *Rio de Janeiro*: C. E. B., 1943. 80 pp.

**Neves, J. C. A.**—A inconfidência mineira: Cláudio Manoel da Costa. *Rio de Janeiro*: Pongetti, 1943. 193 pp.

**Olveira, Alberto de.**—Os cem melhores sonetos brasileiros. *Rio de Janeiro*: Freitas Bastos, 1944. 228 pp.

—Póstuma, ed. A. de Castro. *Ibid.*: Acad. Brasileira de Letras, 1944. 96 pp.

**Padua, C. T. de.**—O dialeto brasileiro: ensaio de filologia e sociologia sobre a língua falada no Brasil. *Curitiba*: Guaiara, 1942. 100 pp.

**Pereira, A. N.**—Leis gerais da língua portuguesa. *Rio de Janeiro*: S. C. P., 1940.

**Pereira, Astrojido.**—Machado de Assis, novelista del segundo reinado. *Buenos Aires*: Problemas Americanos, 1942. 62 pp.

**Pinto, P. A.**—Vocabulos y frases: miudezas e linguagem luso-brasileira. *Rio de Janeiro*: Alves, 1942. 212 pp.

**Pontes, Elói.**—Machado de Assis. *São Paulo*: Ed. Cultura, 1943. 91 pp.

—A vida exuberante de Olavo Bilac. 2 v. *Rio de Janeiro*: Olympio, 1944.

**Quental, A. de.**—Sonetos completos e poemas escolhidos, ed. Bandeira. *Rio de Janeiro*: Livros de Portugal, 1942. ix + 315 pp.

**Rebêlo, Marques.**—Vida e obra de Manuel Antônio de Almeida. *Rio de Janeiro*: Inst. Nac. do Livro, 1943. 131 pp.

**Santos, A. V.**—A lírica de Luiz Gama. *Rio de Janeiro*: Est. Gr. Atlântico, 1944. 64 pp.

**Sequeira, F. M. B. de.**—Raimundo Correia: sua vida e sua obra. *Rio de Janeiro*: Acad. Brasileira, 1942. 224 pp.

**Stavrou, Christopher.**—Pronunciation of Portuguese in Brazil. *Philadelphia*: McKay, 1946. xiv + 152 pp. \$2.50.

**Vergara, Pedro.**—A poesia moderna rio-grandense. *Rio de Janeiro*, 1943. 110 pp.

#### GENERAL

**Dillon, Myles.**—The Cycles of the Kings [Irish sagas]. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1946. viii + 124 pp. \$3.25.

**Hughes, R. M.**—A Study of American Graduate Schools Conferring the Doctorate, 1937-8 to 1941-2. *Ames, Iowa*: 1946. 67 pp. lithotyped.

**Smith, Horatio (genl. ed.).**—Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1947. xiv + 899 pp. \$10.00.

**The World of Learning**, with an introduction by Gilbert Murray. *London*: Europa Pubs., 1947. vi + 520 pp. £3.

1947

itera-  
E. B.,

eira:  
eiro:

hores  
reitas

bid.:  
o.

eiro:  
ngua  
1942.

ngua  
1940.  
assis,  
ires:

miú-  
o de

São

ilac.

os e  
o de  
ix +

nuel  
Inst.

ama.  
944.

reia:  
acad.

n of  
Kay,

rio-  
pp.

ings  
ress,

ican  
rate,  
67

nbia  
ure.  
v +

tro-  
rop:

947

era-  
B.,

ira:  
iro:

ores  
eitas

vid.:

iro:  
agua  
942.

agua  
940.  
ssis,  
res:

niú-  
o de

São

ilac.

s e  
o de  
x +

nuel  
Inst.

ama.  
944.

reia:  
Acad.

n of  
Kay,

rio-  
pp-

Kings  
Press,

frican  
rate,  
67

mbia  
ature.  
iv +

ntro-  
urop:

The Huntington Library announces an outstanding addition to its  
publications in the English Renaissance

## SHAKESPEARE'S 'HISTORIES' MIRRORS OF ELIZABETHAN POLICY

By LILY B. CAMPBELL

A discussion of Elizabethan history, historiography, and politics; with a study of each of Shakespeare's history plays as elucidating a political problem of Elizabeth's day. The author is well known for her Shakespearean studies, and for her editions of *The Mirror for Magistrates* and *Parts Added to "The Mirror for Magistrates,"* recently published by the Cambridge University Press in co-operation with the Huntington Library. 346 pages \$6.75

### RENAISSANCE STUDIES AND SOURCE BOOKS PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED:

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON, *Astronomical Thought  
in Renaissance England* (\$3.25)

LOUIS B. WRIGHT, *Middle-Class Culture in  
Elizabethan England* (\$5.00)

NICHOLAS BRETON, *The Arbor of Amorous  
Devices*, 1597 (\$3.00); *Brittons Bowre  
of Delights*, 1591 (\$3.00). Facsimiles,  
edited by H. E. Rollins (Together, \$5.00)

*Christmas Carols Printed in the Sixteenth  
Century*, edited by E. B. Reed (\$3.00)

*A Discourse upon the Exposition & Under-  
standing of Statutes*, edited by Samuel E.  
Thorne (\$5.00)

*Mary of Nimwegen*, facsimile with intro-  
duction by Harry M. Ayres and A. J.  
Barnouw (\$1.50)

THOMAS MOFFET, *Nobilis*. A Life of Sir  
Philip Sidney, translated and edited by  
Virgil B. Heltzel and Hoyt H. Hudson  
(\$3.75)

PLUTARCH, *The Quyetis of Mynde*, translated  
by Thomas Wyat. Facsimile, edited by  
C. R. Baskervill (\$1.50)

### SHAKESPEAREANA

*Hamlet*. Collotype facsimiles of the  
"bad quarto" of 1603 (\$3.00)  
and the "good quarto" of 1604  
(\$3.50), the latter with introduc-  
tion by O. J. Campbell (Together,  
\$5.00)

*Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's  
Troilus and Cressida*, by O. J.  
Campbell (\$3.00)

*Parts Added to "The Mirror for  
Magistrates"* by John Higgins and  
Thomas Blenerhasset, edited by Lily  
B. Campbell (\$12.00)

### THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY:

A Journal for the History and Interpreta-  
tion of English and American Civilization.  
This journal contains many articles and  
notes on the English Renaissance. Send  
for a complete list of articles in past issues.

\$5.00 a year \$1.50 a copy

*A full list of Huntington Library Publications will be sent on request.*

THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

SAN MARINO 15, CALIFORNIA



MODERN

PRACTICAL

THOROUGH

## Conversational Approach to German

By C. M. Purin, *University of Wisconsin*; John L. Kind,  
*University of Tennessee*; and F. H. Reinsch,  
*University of California at Los Angeles*

For beginning students who wish to acquire (1) fluency in speaking German and (2) a thorough knowledge of the grammar necessary for correct speech and intelligent reading in German. Drill is given in the form of *speech patterns* to fix new essentials of grammar. Topical dialogues of everyday import—with English translation on following pages—are accompanied by questions requiring oral answers, vocabulary and idiom lists, analysis of the grammar of spoken German, and varied exercises. *In press.*

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON



H  
H